

ED 023 799

VT 003 310

By - Adams, Leonard P.; And Others

Viable Farmer-Worker Relationships: A Study of Selected Cases in New York State in 1966. Bulletin 1019.

New York Agricultural Experiment Station, Ithaca.; State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Coll. of Agriculture at

Cornell.; State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell Univ.

Pub Date Oct 67

Note - 75p.

EDRS Price MF -\$050 HC -\$385

Descriptors - *Agricultural Laborers, Employee Attitudes, Employer Attitudes, *Employer Employee Relationship, Employment Problems, *Farmers, *Farm Labor, Human Relations, Interviews, *Job Satisfaction, Migrant Workers, Seasonal Laborers, Work Environment

Identifiers - New York

In an effort to understand the nationwide problem of recruitment, training, and retention of farm workers, 28 representative New York farm operators with a reputation for success in dealing with hired workers were interviewed in the summer of 1966. Information obtained included personal and educational characteristics, attitudes and aspirations, characteristics of the farm, labor on the farm, employer-employee relationships, supervision, and opinions with illustrative examples. Some general positive policies and practices resulting in good relationships were: (1) Conscious effort was initiated by the employer to produce mutually satisfactory relationships, (2) Relationships resulted from a combination of policies and practices plus a genuine liking for farm work, (3) Fair treatment was considered important by employees, (4) Supervision of seasonal labor by owner-operators or by regular employees rather than by crew leaders who recruited and transported the workers resulted in better relationships, and (5) Providing year round employment and fringe benefits resulted in better quality workers. Major difficulties were use of disrespectful language and failure to give sufficiently explicit instructions to employees. Included are case study summaries and a check list on worker-employer relations. (DM)

3.1

Bulletin 1019

October 1967

Viabie Farmer-Worker Relationships

by

Leonard P. Adams

R. Brian How

and

Olaf F. Larson

Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, New York
State College of Agriculture, and New York State School of
Industrial and Labor Relations, Ithaca, New York

ED023799

VT003310

A publication of the Cornell University Agricultural
Experiment Station and the New York State School of
Industrial and Labor Relations, Statutory Colleges of
the State University, at Cornell University

1st printing

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

Viable Farmer-Worker Relationships:
A Study of Selected Cases in New York State
in 1966.

by

Leonard P. Adams *And Others.*
Professor, Industrial and Labor Relations

R. Brian How
Professor, Agricultural Economics

Olaf F. Larson
Professor, Rural Sociology

A JOINT PUBLICATION OF
THE NEW YORK STATE SCHOOL OF INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS
AND

THE NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE

AND

4 *at a new york*
THE CORNELL UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION, *Ithaca.*

AT

CORNELL UNIVERSITY
ITHACA, NEW YORK

Contents

Preface	vi
I. The Project	1
Selection of Farms	2
Development of Questions and Responses of Farmers	3
Presentation of Findings	5
II. Farm Labor Trends	7
Farm Labor Incomes	10
Numbers and Types of Farms in New York State	
Hiring Workers	13
Wages Paid and Basis of Payment	17
Some Observations on Farm Labor Market Conditions	17
III. Summaries of Selected Interviews	21
Dairy Farms	21
Supplementary Information on Labor Practices on	
Other Dairy Farms	28
Fruit and Vegetable Farms	34
Supplementary Information on Labor Practices on	
Fruit and Vegetable Farms	51
Poultry Farms	53
Supplementary Information on Labor Practices on	
Poultry Farms	57
IV. Some General Observations	59
Positive Policies and Practices Making for Good Relations ..	60
Practices to be Avoided	62
Problems on Dairy Farms	62
Problems on Fruit and Vegetable Farms	64
Problems on Poultry Farms	65
Some Observations from the Employee's Point of View	65
Appendix: A Check List on Worker-Employee Relations for	
Consideration by Farm Operators or Managers	69

Preface

THE PROJECT DESCRIBED IN THE FOLLOWING pages was an outcome of a series of discussions initiated by the Cooperative Extension Service at Cornell University. In the Fall of 1965, the Extension Service established a Farm Labor Committee, the primary purposes of which were to stimulate research on problems involving farm labor and to develop education programs that would improve the personnel management practices of New York farmers. The three authors of this report served on this Committee consisting of representatives of the New York State College of Agriculture and the School of Industrial and Labor Relations.

During the course of the Committee discussions, it became evident that the members needed more specific information about how farmers were actually dealing with labor problems; some first-hand information was essential, particularly about farmers who had demonstrated success in getting and holding the workers they needed. The authors of this report, with the advice of other members of the Committee and the support of their respective colleges, developed plans for a field research project in the Spring of 1966. These plans and the method of conducting the project are described in Chapter I.

We are pleased to acknowledge financial assistance from the United States Department of Labor by including the following paragraph.

"The material in this project was prepared under a Grant from the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research, U.S. Department of Labor, under the authority of Title I of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Researchers undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor."

The interviews were conducted by Mr. Ross Azevedo, a Ph.D. candidate at the ILR School, and Mr. Wolfgang Frese, a Ph.D. candidate in the Rural Sociology Department of the College of Agriculture. We are obligated to these two mature young men for completing the interviews with skill and a high sense of responsibility, for many suggestions about

questions for inclusion in the schedules, and for some of the conclusions in our report.

In the preparation of the list of farmers to be contacted and the development of the schedules we had the able assistance of Mr. Ransom Blakeley, whose services were provided by the Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture.

We are indebted to Mrs. Joyce Martin, ILR School, and Miss Lucy M. Cunnings, College of Agriculture, for their patience and persistence in deciphering the tape recordings and field notes made by the interviewers and typing the reports.

The development and conduct of the study has provided an interesting opportunity for close collaboration by people from different academic backgrounds. We hesitate to call this an interdisciplinary study because there was very little conscious effort made to bring the theories of different disciplines to bear on the subject of the study. The primary focus was on the identification of viable solutions to the farm-labor management problems seen by farmers and their employees. We were all aware of the need for exploring all possible explanations of the situations on farms, including the economic, sociological, demographic, managerial, and political forces involved. In this sense the project was at least multidimensional. The outcome as reported herein is solely our responsibility.

L.P.A.
R.B.H.
O.F.L.

March 1967
Ithaca, N.Y.

I

The Project

AS IS KNOWN BY NEARLY EVERY farmer in New York State who, in recent years, has tried to hire workers, the labor supply has tightened up, and it has become increasingly difficult to find the quality of help desired. This situation, of course, is not unique; the problem of recruitment, training, and retention of farm workers has become nationwide. Yet some farmers seem to have much less trouble than do others in getting and keeping the workers they need. These farmers have the reputation of being "good people to work for" and their reputation is known to workers, agricultural experts, county agents, the public employment service, and other farmers. Each major type of farming activity has a select group with the reputation for success in dealing with hired workers.

The practices and experiences of some of these "successful" farmers would, it was hoped, provide information useful for a better understanding of farmer-worker relationships and might suggest to other farmers better ways of dealing with their own problems. The assumptions were that the successful farmers would:

1. Pay the highest wages and offer the most "fringe" benefits and special financial incentives such as bonuses and profit-sharing plans;
2. Provide, in the case of year-round workers, some time off from work each week and limit the number of hours of work per day;
3. Provide decent housing;
4. Use management techniques in dealing with workers that recognize that farm workers are human beings who are sensitive to job opportunities in other industries;

5. Be among the economically prosperous farms so that they could afford to pay well and provide suitable benefits.

To test the validity of these assumptions and provide some clues to other possible explanations for success, farmers and their workers would be asked special sets of questions. Farm operators (or managers) on selected farms would be interviewed in such a way as to cover a standard set of questions but also to permit the farmer to express his opinions freely on any elements in his experience that seemed pertinent and significant. A similar set of questions was developed for an interview with at least one employee of each farm operator. Copies of the schedules used by the interviewers are available in a separate supplement.

Selection of Farms

After consultation with the sources of information about who the more successful farm operators were, a list of prime prospects and alternates for interviews was drawn up. Because of the limited time available for interviews (the list of questions was not finally decided on until early August after a series of pretests), it was decided to omit farms on Long Island and in the northernmost counties so that the interviewers would be able to visit a maximum number of farms. The remaining list of farms where interviews would be conducted was divided as shown in Table I.

Table I: Number and Type of Farms Included in Interviews, Summer 1966

<i>Region</i>	<i>Dairy</i>	<i>Dairy & Fruit</i>	<i>Dairy & Veg.</i>	<i>Fruit</i>	<i>Fruit & Veg.</i>	<i>Vege- table</i>	<i>Poultry</i>	<i>Totals by region</i>
Hudson Valley ...	3	0	0	2	0	4	2	11
Mohawk Valley ...	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Lake Plain .	2	1	2	3	1	1	0	10
Southern Tier.....	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5
Totals by type	10	1	2	5	1	5	4	28

The 28 farms listed in Table I were chosen from a list of 56 compiled on the basis of suggestions from several knowledgeable people.

Four other farms were visited, and interviews were conducted during the preliminary phase of the study when the interviewing schedules were being tested and developed. These four were not complete in all respects, and data from them are not included in this report.

The selection of farms for inclusion in the study represents an attempt to get information on different types of activities in a variety of localities and sizes of operations. But the 28 farms included simply represent interesting cases of operations said to be illustrative of "successful" labor-management relations and nothing more. Each case is unique in some respects and, as the subsequent discussion will show, some situations apparently were more "successful" than others. No attempt was made to select a statistically valid sample in the sense of choosing farms in proportion to their numbers according to type of farm hiring labor.¹ All of these points must be remembered in interpreting the results.

Development of Questions and Responses of Farmers

A considerable amount of time and effort was devoted to the development of questions to be asked of all farmers and of one or more of their employees. The initial inclination was to include more questions than could possibly be answered in the course of an interview lasting an hour or an hour and a half. After discussions with a variety of specialists on different phases of agriculture and a few trial interviews, the list was shortened considerably and most interviews with farmers were conducted within an hour and a half. This time limit also permitted the farmer and the employees to express their opinions on any phase of the employer-employee relationship that seemed to them important and not fully covered by the questions.

The general line of questions asked were framed, of course, for the primary purpose of discovering what policies and practices resulted in successful recruitment, retention, and efficient use of farm workers. It

¹ There were 20,544 farms in the state that hired one or more workers in 1959. Two-thirds of these were dairy farms. Three-fourths of them hired year-round workers (persons who worked 150 days or more per year). *U.S. Census of Agriculture*, Vol. I, Part 7, State Table 15.

One reason for not covering more dairy farms is that a Ph.D. thesis on financial incentive plans in operation with special reference to dairy farms was completed in 1966 by P. W. H. Weightman under the direction of Professor L. C. Cunningham in the College of Agriculture at Cornell. A number of "successful" farms in our list were interviewed in Dr. Weightman's survey which will be published in 1967.

was realized, however, that what might prove successful for one farmer might not work so well for another. In short, the personal and educational backgrounds of the farmer and his employees were assumed to be important, and so were the means by which various policies and practices were applied. The final schedules used, therefore, covered the following major topics:

1. Personal and educational characteristics;
2. Attitudes and aspirations;
3. Characteristics of the farm;
4. Labor on the farm (kind of job, numbers of hired and family workers, characteristics of employees and their hours, pay, benefits, etc., sources and methods of recruiting workers);
5. Employer-employee relationships both on and off the job;
6. Supervision — who does it, methods used to settle grievances and misunderstandings;
7. Opinions on what makes for successful and unsuccessful employee-employer relationships with illustrative examples.

Separate schedules were developed for year-round employees and for crew leaders on farms using seasonal labor. Most of the employees interviewed were year-round workers, which the findings presented below reflect. The interviews with employees, therefore, do not indicate adequately the feelings and opinions of seasonal workers, even though some interviews were obtained with crew leaders. Farm work and life in farm labor camps as seen by seasonal workers is being studied in a separate project.²

In general the questions asked of year-round employees covered the same points as those asked of farmers. In addition, the employees were invited to discuss the general topic of job satisfaction, their methods of finding jobs, their relationships with their present employer, and what they thought made for "successful" relationships with employers.

All interviews were conducted in the period from August 1 to September 22, 1966. The two Cornell graduate student interviewers occasionally visited the same farm together and divided the interviewing task between them. Most of the farms, however, were visited by only

² A project under the direction of Professor William Friedland, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, was started in the summer of 1966 with financial assistance from the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, U.S. Department of Labor and the School.

one interviewer. Progress with the interviewing was reviewed each week by the interviewers with the project directors. These discussions served as a means of clarifying unanticipated questions about the schedules and problem situations and of enabling all concerned to keep up to date with the progress on the project.

The response of both farmers and employees was most encouraging. Both groups seemed to feel that the general topic was important and that something useful might come out of the project. Only one farmer declined to participate, and he explained that his reluctance reflected mainly a lack of time.

The results of the interviews were recorded in two different ways. Initially the interviewers made notes as the farmer or worker talked and then wrote up an account shortly after the interviews were completed. Later, with the permission of those interviewed, tape recorders were used experimentally and typists transcribed from the tapes. This method provided the most interesting records mainly because the unedited responses revealed exactly how the parties responded to the questions. The language used was often as revealing as the factual content of the comments.

Presentation of Findings

Over four hundred pages of typewritten reports resulted from the interviews on twenty-eight farms. A reading of this mass of information showed that there was a lot of repetition in the responses and some irrelevant and unimportant information. The best way to provide a digest of the important findings seemed to be to select a few cases representing different types of farms, to summarize the highlights of these, and to supplement these case reports with interesting variations on major points drawn from other cases. In addition, the information in the cases provides general suggestions about successful farm labor policies and practices that have been presented in summary form. This section is followed by some concluding observations and suggestions for dealing with farm manpower problems in the years ahead.

The writing up of the findings has been a collaborative effort of all three project directors with the assistance of the two interviewers. All of us worked on the general findings and conclusions, but there was a division of labor on other parts. Professor Adams took primary responsibility for the Introduction, Chapter II on Farm Labor in New York State, and the subsection on poultry farms. Professor How wrote the subsection on the dairy farms, and Professor Larson took responsibility for the subsection on fruit and vegetable farms.

Worker-management relations on New York farms in the summer of 1966 cannot be understood fully without some background information on developments and trends in the general farm labor situation in recent years. Farm labor has become a scarce resource. New legislation and regulations have restricted the importation of foreign workers. Farmers have tried to meet the shortages by substituting machinery for labor in many instances, but this change has produced unexpected developments some of which have acted to decrease further the supply of workers particularly for seasonal jobs. The farmer in 1966, therefore, who needed to hire workers and wanted to keep them himself needed certain management know-how to compete successfully with the growing demands for workers in a seller's labor market. The next chapter provides a brief overview of the trends in the farm labor situation in New York State in recent years.

II

Farm Labor Trends

FARM LABOR TRENDS AND DEVELOP-
ments in the nation and in New York State during the past fifteen years have been profoundly affected by two major trends, one directly concerned with agriculture and one outside it. The first might be described as the intensification of a multidimensional technological revolution which has greatly increased the productivity of workers on farms by means of new and greater use of machinery, expanded use of fertilizers and lime, and improved seeds and livestock. One result has been to increase output per man-hour on farms in the nation by about 90 percent from 1950 to 1960 while total farm employment declined about 27 percent. These trends accelerated between 1960 and 1965 and are likely to continue in the same direction although the rates may decline. (See Tables IV and V below.)

The second development, outside agriculture itself, has two main facets. One has been the growth of job opportunities in non-agricultural industries particularly in trade, service, and government. The increase in these fields has been much greater since 1960, although the new opportunities also provided a growing number of jobs for displaced farm workers during the 1950's. Most of the jobs provided better incomes than hired workers could earn on farms so that there has been a substantial shift to non-farm employment.¹ A second factor which has tended to reduce the farm labor supply has been the growing social

¹ See Robert L. Raimon, "Interstate Migration and Wage Theory," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. XLIV, No. 4, Nov. 1962, for a study of interstate migration that shows a movement of manual workers from low-wage to high-wage areas.

and political pressures to improve the status and level of living of hired farm workers. These pressures have taken several forms, including federal restrictions on the importation of foreign workers.

Table II: Farm Employment and Productivity, United States, 1930-65

Year	Farm employment (Thousands) ^a			Farm output (Index: 1957-59 = 100)			
	Total	Family workers	Hired workers	Per unit of total input	Per man-hour		
					Total	Crops	Live- stock
1930.....	12,497	9,307	3,190	63	28	27	47
1935.....	12,733	9,855	2,878	69	31	31	44
1940.....	10,979	8,300	2,679	72	36	37	50
1945.....	10,000	7,881	2,119	82	46	46	58
1950.....	9,926	7,597	2,329	85	61	63	68
1951.....	9,546	7,310	2,236	86	62	61	72
1952.....	9,149	7,005	2,144	89	68	67	74
1953.....	8,864	6,775	2,089	90	71	69	76
1954.....	8,651	6,570	2,081	91	74	73	80
1955.....	8,381	6,345	2,036	94	80	77	85
1956.....	7,852	5,900	1,952	96	86	83	89
1957.....	7,600	5,660	1,940	96	91	90	92
1958.....	7,503	5,521	1,982	103	103	105	100
1959.....	7,342	5,390	1,952	101	106	105	108
1960.....	7,057	5,172	1,885	105	115	114	113
1961.....	6,919	5,029	1,890	106	120	119	120
1962.....	6,700	4,873	1,827	107	127	124	127
1963.....	6,518	4,738	1,780	110	135	132	137
1964.....	6,110	4,506	1,604	109	141	133	147
1965 ^b	5,609	4,125	1,484	112	151	148	149

^a Includes persons doing farm work on all farms. These data, published by the Department of Agriculture, Statistical Reporting Service, differ from those on agricultural employment reported by the Department of Labor because of differences in the method of approach, in concepts of employment, and in time of month for which the data are collected. For further explanation, see monthly report *Farm Labor, September, 1958*, pp. 3-4.

^b Preliminary

Sources: Department of Agriculture and Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

The net effect of these two major trends has been to reduce the number of hired workers on farms nationally and in New York State while the output of farm commodities increased. Table II shows the

national trends in farm population, employment, and productivity. Data on farm output per man-hour are not available for New York State, but there are figures to show that the decline in total farm employment in this state exceeded the national loss.²

Projections of employment in agriculture and non-agricultural industries prepared by the U.S. Department of Labor for the five years 1965-1970 show that the past trends indicated above will continue. Employment in agriculture in the nation is expected to decline by 11 percent in this period, or a little over 2 percent per year. It is likely that the same trend will prevail in New York State.

According to data compiled from selected farmers by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the average monthly labor force on New York farms in 1966 was only 46 percent of the number reported in 1950. The decrease was much greater for hired farm workers than for farm operators and family workers. The number of hired workers on farms during 1966 was only 37 percent of that for 1950; the number of family workers, including farm operators, was 50 percent of the 1950 number. The figures below show the steady decline in both categories of farm workers.

Table III: Trends in Farm Labor Force in New York State
(Annual averages^a in thousands)

	1950	Average 1950-59	Average 1960-64	1965	1966
Total workers on farms.....	248	207	150	122	113
Family workers.....	159	135	99	84	80
Hired workers.....	89	72	51	38	33

^a Figures for 1950 from *Statistical Bulletin*, No. 236, U.S. Department of Agriculture; for 1950-59 from *Agricultural Statistics*, 1962, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Table 647; for other years from various issues of *Farm Labor*, U.S. Department of Agriculture. "Family workers" includes farm operators doing one or more hours of farm work and members of their families working fifteen hours or more, without cash wages, during the survey week. "Hired workers" includes all persons doing one or more hours of farm work for pay during the survey week.

When only the employment at the peak months is considered, the long-time trend toward a decrease in New York's farm labor force is equally clear. In 1950, hired workers numbered 140,000 at the harvest

² Sources: *U.S. Census*, 1960, General, Social and Economic Characteristics, New York, Table 57. *U.S. Census*, 1950, Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population, Part 32, New York, Table 28.

peak; at the same season in 1965 there were only 59,000 hired workers, 42 percent of the 1950 figure. For family workers, the 1965 peak of 98,000 was 54 percent of the 182,000 peak in 1950. As Table III shows, hired farm workers, as compared with operators and other family workers, are a minority in the total farm labor force of New York State. This is true at the peak as well as at the low season of employment.

Detailed current information about the composition of the employed labor force of the state and, in particular, about the characteristics of the several important categories of farm workers is not available. More is known about the seasonal workers and the characteristics of the interstate worker than is known about the other categories.⁴

Farm Labor Incomes

The movement of people out of agriculture reflects a mixture of "push" and "pull" forces. Improvements in technology have made it possible to increase output with less labor input, and those farmers not in a position to introduce the improvements have been forced to look elsewhere for a living. Fortunately for them, there have been inducements to move into other industries where earnings were better if suitable job openings could be found. The transition has not always been easy, as the higher rates of unemployment among agricultural workers show.⁵ But for those employed in factories, average annual earnings have been about double those of farm employees. This big spread in earnings has, of course, drawn off some of the better workers in agriculture who could have kept their farm jobs. The decline in

⁴ Olaf F. Larson and Emmit F. Sharp, *Migratory Farm Workers in the Atlantic Coast Stream. I. Changes in New York, 1953 and 1957*, Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 948 (Ithaca, 1960); Emmit F. Sharp and Olaf F. Larson, *Migratory Farm Workers in the Atlantic Coast Stream. II. Education of New York Workers and Their Children, 1953 and 1957*, Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 949 (Ithaca, 1960); and Donald R. Whyte, Emmit F. Sharp, Olaf F. Larson and Nelson L. LeRay, *Migratory Farmworkers in New York State, 1959 and Comparisons with 1953, 1957, and 1958*, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, ARS 43-121 (Washington, 1960).

⁵ See *Manpower Report of the President and Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training*, U.S. Department of Labor, March 1966, p. 169. The rate of unemployment in agriculture for experienced workers has been 40 to 70 percent higher than the national average. This may reflect unfavorable seasonal elements as well as greater displacements in agriculture.

Table 1V: Actual and Projected Employment by Industry in the United States, 1960-1970
(Numbers in thousands)

Industry division	Actual, 1960		Actual, 1965		Projected, 1970 ^a		Change, 1960-65		Change, 1965-70	
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total employment ^b	59,926	100.0	65,017	100.0	72,823	100.0	5,091	8.5	7,806	12.0
Agriculture	5,723	9.6	4,585	7.1	4,080	5.6	-1,138	-19.9	-505	-11.0
Non-agricultural industries	54,203	90.4	60,432 ^c	92.9	68,743	94.4	6,229	11.5	8,311	13.8
Goods-producing industries	20,393	34.0	21,823	33.6	23,168	31.8	1,430	7.0	1,345	6.2
Mining	712	1.2	628	1.0	586	.8	-84	-11.8	-42	-6.7
Contract construction	2,885	4.8	3,211	4.9	3,700	5.1	326	11.3	489	15.2
Manufacturing	16,796	28.0	17,984	27.7	18,882	25.9	1,188	7.1	898	5.0
Service-producing industries	33,809	56.4	38,608	59.4	45,575	62.6	4,799	14.2	6,967	18.0
Transportation and public utilities	4,004	6.7	4,031	6.2	4,106	5.6	27	.7	75	1.9
Transportation	2,549	4.3	2,530	3.9	2,600	3.6	-19	-.7	70	2.8
Communication	840	1.4	881	1.4	861	1.2	41	4.9	-20	-2.3
Electric, gas, sanitary services	615	1.0	620	1.0	645	.9	5	.8	25	4.0
Wholesale and retail trade	11,391	19.0	12,585	19.4	14,195	19.5	1,194	10.5	1,610	12.8
Finance, insurance, real estate	2,669	4.5	3,043	4.7	3,494	4.8	374	14.0	451	14.8
Service and miscellaneous	7,392	12.3	8,903	13.7	11,097	15.2	1,511	20.4	2,194	24.6
Government	8,353	13.9	10,046	15.5	12,683	17.4	1,693	20.3	2,637	26.2
Federal ^d	2,270	3.8	2,379	3.7	2,524	3.5	109	4.8	145	6.1
State and local	6,083	10.2	7,667	11.8	10,159	14.0	1,584	26.0	2,492	32.5

^a Based on an assumption of 3 percent unemployment.

^b Represents agricultural employment from the monthly household survey of the labor force and non-agricultural wage and salary employment from the establishment survey. Non-farm self-employed, unpaid family workers, and domestics are not included.

^c Preliminary.

^d Data relate to civilian employment only, excluding the Central Intelligence Agency and National Security Agency.

Source: *Manpower Report of the President*, March, 1966.

Table V: Actual and Projected Employment by Major Occupation Group in the United States, 1960 to 1975

Major occupation group	Actual				Projected ^a				Change, 1960-65		Change, 1965-75	
	1960		1965		1970		1975		Number (mil- ions)		Percent ^b	
	Number (thou- sands)	Percent distri- bution	Number (thou- sands)	Percent distri- bution	Number (mil- lions)	Percent distri- bution	Number (mil- lions)	Percent distri- bution	Number (mil- ions)	Percent ^b	Number (mil- lions)	Percent ^b
Total employment ^c	66,681	100.0	72,179	100.0	81.2	100.0	88.7	100.0	5.5	8.2	16.5	22.9
Professional, technical, and kindred workers.	7,475	11.2	8,883	12.3	11.1	13.7	13.2	14.9	1.4	18.8	4.3	48.6
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	7,067	10.6	7,340	10.2	8.4	10.3	9.2	10.4	.3	3.9	1.9	25.3
Clerical and kindred workers	9,783	14.7	11,166	15.5	13.2	16.3	14.6	16.5	1.4	14.1	3.4	30.8
Sales workers	4,401	6.6	4,715	6.5	5.3	6.5	5.8	6.5	.3	7.1	1.1	23.0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.	8,560	12.8	9,221	12.8	10.4	12.8	11.4	12.8	.7	7.7	2.2	23.6
Operatives and kindred workers	11,986	18.0	13,390	18.6	14.2	17.5	14.8	16.7	1.4	11.7	1.4	10.5
Service workers, includ- ing private household	8,349	12.5	9,342	12.9	11.0	13.5	12.5	14.1	1.0	11.9	3.2	33.8
Laborers, except farm and mine	3,665	5.5	3,855	5.3	3.7	4.6	3.7	4.2	.2	5.2	-.2	-4.0 ^d
Farmers and farm managers, laborers, and foremen	5,395	8.1	4,265	5.9	3.9	4.8	3.5	3.9	-1.1	-20.9	-.8	-17.9

^a Based on an assumption of 3 percent unemployment.

^b Based on data in thousands where available.

^c Represents employment as covered by the monthly household survey of the labor force. Differs from the industry projections shown in Table IV in that non-agricultural self-employed, unpaid family workers, and domestics are included.

^d Employment is projected at about the level of the past decade; however, because 1965 employment was unusually high, reflecting an abnormally sharp increase in manufacturing, the projected percent change from 1965 indicates an apparent decline.

Source: *Manpower Report of the President*, March, 1966.

effective manpower in agriculture, therefore, has been greater than the loss in terms of numbers suggests. As Table VI shows, the big difference between annual farm income per worker and annual wages of the employed factory worker has not changed greatly during the past fifteen years. Although farm earnings have increased, the rise in incomes in factory workers has been even greater, so that the farm worker has slowly been losing ground.

Numbers and Types of Farms in New York State Hiring Workers

Both nationally and in New York State, the "push" and "pull" forces at work on farm employment have reduced the number of farms and, in the state, the acreage devoted to farming. The decline in farms has been of about the same magnitude as the drop in total employment.⁶ Only a fraction of the total number of farmers, however, hire labor. According to the Census of Agriculture data for 1959, there were 82,000 farms in New York State of which 56,760 sold products valued at \$50 or more. Only 20,544 of these "commercial farms," or about one-fourth of the total farms, reported that they hired any workers in the fall of 1959.⁷ Employment problems are concentrated, therefore, on a relatively small number of farms in the state.

Table VII shows by type of farm where the hired workers were concentrated in 1959. Over 45 percent of these workers were on dairy farms where more than half were employed for 150 days or more. The other types of farms provided many less "regular" jobs. Producers of dairy products, fruits, and vegetables were the leading employers of seasonal workers. Poultry farmers hired only 5 percent of the workers, and these were mainly "regulars."

Over 90 percent of the farmers who hired workers in the fall of 1959 had less than five people on their payrolls and 60 percent had only one employee (see Table VIII). About 70 percent of the dairy farms were operated by one "regular" hired worker and the owner. But nearly one-fifth of the dairy farms had two regular hired men and the balance of nearly 10 percent had three or more hired men. Most of the dairy farmers who employed seasonal workers added only one or two people. Most farms in the dairy industry that hire any workers can, therefore, be considered "small" employers, who in the past have usually been exempted from coverage by social insurance and protective labor legislation on the basis of size as well as of type of industry.

⁶ *U.S. Census of Agriculture, 1959, Vol. II.*

⁷ *Ibid.*

Table VI: Income of Farm and Factory Workers, United States, 1950-1965

Year	Persons engaged in agriculture				Average annual wage per employed factory worker ^c	Average hourly earnings of factory workers
	Net income from farming ^a (million dollars)	Number of farm workers ^b (thousands)	Average annual farm income per worker			
			Dollars	Pct. farm of factory	Dollars	Dollars
1950.....	\$ 15,672	9,926	\$ 1,579	52	\$ 3,033	\$ 1.44
1951.....	17,724	9,546	1,857	56	3,294	1.56
1952.....	16,986	9,149	1,857	53	3,492	1.65
1953.....	16,447	8,864	1,855	51	3,664	1.74
1954.....	14,608	8,651	1,689	46	3,665	1.78
1955.....	13,864	8,381	1,654	42	3,936	1.86
1956.....	14,541	7,852	1,852	45	4,097	1.95
1957.....	13,441	7,600	1,769	42	4,243	2.05
1958.....	15,517	7,503	2,068	48	4,301	2.11
1959.....	14,244	7,342	1,940	42	4,590	2.19
1960.....	14,537	7,057	2,060	44	4,665	2.26
1961.....	15,491	6,919	2,239	47	4,802	2.32
1962.....	15,445	6,700	2,305	46	5,021	2.39
1963.....	15,420	6,518	2,366	46	5,181	2.46
1964.....	15,706	6,110	2,571	48	5,354	2.53
1965.....	16,968	5,610	3,025	54	5,592	2.61

^a Realized net income of farm operators including Government payments, plus total farm wages.

^b Represents the average number of persons engaged in agriculture during the year, including farm operators and other family workers (except those doing housework only) as well as hired workers.

^c Average weekly earnings of production workers or non-supervisory employees in manufacturing, multiplied by 52.

Source: *Farm Income Situation*, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, July 1966.

Table VII: Number and Type of Hired Workers in New York State by Type of Farm, 1959^a

Type of farm ^d	Hired workers — all types				Regular workers ^b				Seasonal workers ^c			
	Farms reporting		Workers		Farms reporting		Workers		Farms reporting		Workers	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Cash-grain.....	318	1.5	506	1.1	173	1.1	273	0.9	175	2.3	233	1.3
Other field crops.....	554	2.7	2,356	5.0	404	2.5	1,100	3.8	323	4.4	1,256	7.1
Vegetables.....	717	3.5	3,438	7.4	433	2.7	1,684	5.8	450	6.1	1,754	9.9
Fruits & nuts.....	1,216	5.9	6,723	14.4	801	5.1	1,932	6.7	840	11.4	4,791	27.1
Poultry.....	1,144	5.6	2,303	4.9	828	5.2	1,495	5.2	500	6.8	808	4.6
Dairy.....	13,596	66.2	21,153	45.3	11,123	70.2	16,296	56.2	3,763	51.0	4,857	27.4
Livestock*.....	529	2.6	990	2.1	417	2.6	729	2.5	178	2.4	261	1.5
General.....	601	2.9	2,269	4.9	426	2.7	904	3.1	296	4.0	1,365	7.7
Misc. & unclassified.....	1,869	9.1	6,941	14.9	1,244	7.9	4,571	15.8	859	11.6	2,370	13.4
Total.....	20,544	100.0	46,679	100.0	15,849	100.0	28,984	100.0	7,384	100.0	17,695	100.0

* Other than dairy or poultry.

^a Week preceding enumeration (starting date in New York for enumeration is Oct. 28; average enumeration date Nov. 8-14).

^b To be employed 150 or more days.

^c To be employed less than 150 days.

^d Type limited to farms classified as "commercial."

Note: Data represent expansion from samples; samples included all farms with 1,000 or more acres, or with estimated total sales of \$100,000 or more in 1959 and approximately 20 percent of all other farms.

Source: 1959 Census of Agriculture, Vol. I, Part 7, State Table 15.

Table VIII: Number and Type of Workers Hired in New York State by Type of Farm, 1959

<i>Type of farm</i>	<i>Farms reporting number of hired workers (all types)</i>					<i>Total</i>
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3 or 4</i>	<i>5 to 9</i>	<i>10 or more</i>	
Cash grain.....	192	92	27	7	0	318
Other field crops...	91	137	146	129	51	554
Vegetables.....	173	148	150	166	80	717
Fruits & nuts.....	326	255	188	231	216	1,216
Poultry.....	608	321	135	70	10	1,144
Dairy.....	9,088	3,001	1,185	275	47	13,596
Livestock*.....	310	146	44	21	8	529
General.....	309	101	91	48	52	601
Misc. & unclassified	1,008	309	282	141	129	1,869
Total.....	12,105	4,510	2,248	1,088	593	20,544
<i>Farms reporting number of regular workers</i>						
Cash grain.....	114	36	17	6	0	173
Other field crops...	162	76	93	55	15	404
Vegetables.....	134	103	79	70	47	433
Fruits & nuts.....	438	172	100	52	39	801
Poultry.....	490	216	83	34	5	828
Dairy.....	7,899	2,177	830	198	19	11,123
Livestock*.....	264	100	40	6	7	417
General.....	239	81	68	31	7	426
Misc. & unclassified	666	243	157	90	88	1,244
Total.....	10,406	3,207	1,467	542	227	15,849
<i>Farms reporting number of seasonal workers</i>						
Cash grain.....	128	36	11	0	0	175
Other field crops...	80	87	66	73	20	323
Vegetables.....	148	96	82	103	21	450
Fruits & nuts.....	185	176	133	178	168	840
Poultry.....	340	115	31	12	2	500
Dairy.....	3,060	547	105	41	10	3,763
Livestock*.....	139	27	5	6	1	178
General.....	154	55	40	16	31	296
Misc. & unclassified	520	146	97	70	26	859
Total.....	4,754	1,285	567	499	279	7,384

* Other than dairy or poultry.

Note: A farm may have only regular workers, only seasonal workers, or both regular and seasonal workers.

Wages Paid and Basis of Payment

Table IX shows that the most common basis of payment of hired farm workers in 1959 was by the week, and that monthly pay periods were the second most frequently used. Piece-rate methods were used on only about 5 percent of the farms and mainly by fruit and vegetable growers. About one-fourth of all hired workers were paid on an hourly basis.

The average rates of wages paid per unit of time in 1959 is shown in Table X. The average hourly rate was \$1.11 but by 1966 the average had increased to about \$1.32. These data, however, do not include items furnished by farmers such as housing, food, and other benefits. The relatively long hours of work on farms compared with factory workers is also evident in Table X. Factory production workers in New York State in 1959 averaged about thirty-nine hours per week and were paid \$2.23 per hour.⁸ Farm workers (on a weekly and monthly basis) put in considerably more time (over 25 percent more) and earned (if \$1.11 per hour is taken as an average) only about two-thirds as much. There was obviously a financial incentive for qualified workers to seek factory jobs. But, as the case records presented below will show, some able workers preferred farm work even though it paid less. Furthermore, it is likely that many farm workers could not qualify for factory jobs because of lack of skills, physical or educational deficiencies, or both. They were more likely to qualify for jobs in trade and service industries where wage rates were considerably lower.

Some Observations on Farm Labor Market Conditions

The evidence presented above shows that over the past several years farmers have been hiring fewer and fewer workers. Output of farm products, however, has been increasing rapidly because fewer workers could produce more with the help of machinery, more fertilizer and lime, and improved seed. Those farmers who have had to hire additional workers (the commercial farms endeavoring to expand) have been confronted with growing competition from other industries for the better workers. On the whole, factory workers not only earn considerably more money but work much less time for higher pay. The kinds of workers available for regular farm work have been people who have a special liking for farm work, who could not qualify for other better paying jobs, who have found discriminatory barriers in their paths, or who wanted only seasonal jobs and were willing to travel

⁸ *Farm Labor*, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Statistical Reporting Service.

Table IX: Basis of Wage Payment to Hired Workers in New York State by Type of Farm, 1959

Type of farm	Monthly		Weekly		Daily		Hourly		Piece work	
	No. of farms	No. of persons	No. of farms	No. of persons	No. of farms	No. of persons	No. of farms	No. of persons	No. of farms	No. of persons
Cash grain.....	49	58	113	183	15	20	159	230	15	15
Other field crops.....	26	56	271	703	64	168	287	1,051	57	378
Vegetables.....	56	146	249	870	59	199	430	1,598	61	625
Fruits & nuts.....	210	328	299	722	65	190	737	2,505	382	2,978
Poultry.....	192	305	514	933	117	144	494	875	28	46
Dairy.....	6,168	8,468	6,244	9,042	663	749	1,885	2,477	257	417
Livestock*.....	201	376	193	311	51	74	146	218	11	11
General.....	169	241	208	386	39	134	245	543	81	965
Misc. & unclassified.....	323	951	799	3,406	143	218	743	2,186	80	180
Total.....	7,394	10,929	8,890	16,556	1,216	1,896	5,126	11,683	972	5,615

* Other than dairy or poultry.

Table X: Average Wage Rate per Hired Person and Average Number of Hours Worked per Person in New York State by Basis of Pay and Type of Farm, 1959

Type of farm	Monthly		Weekly		Daily		Hourly	
	Average wage rate	Average hours worked	Average wage rate	Average hours worked	Average wage rate	Average hours worked	Average wage rate	Average hours worked
Cash grain.....	\$183	229	\$48	50	\$9.00	8.0	\$1.12	—
Other field crops.....	194	169	60	54	9.45	9.4	1.04	—
Vegetables.....	176	201	57	51	9.12	9.1	1.08	—
Fruits & nuts.....	176	195	55	49	8.95	8.8	1.10	—
Poultry.....	188	194	56	50	6.43	7.1	1.07	—
Dairy.....	157	225	42	51	6.33	8.3	1.06	—
Livestock*.....	194	224	48	52	6.82	9.7	1.11	—
General.....	171	206	50	52	8.31	8.0	1.05	—
Misc. & unclassified.....	255	184	62	44	8.66	7.5	1.29	—
Average all types.....	\$169	219	\$49	50	\$7.63	8.4	\$1.11	—

* Other than dairy or poultry.

from place to place to get them. The problems that farmers in New York State have with respect to recruitment, retention, and development of manpower grow, in large part, out of these facts of life respecting farm labor supplies. On the demand side, farmers in general must sell their products in highly competitive markets and the levels of prices obtained have limited their ability to pay the wages and provide the conditions that would attract the better quality workers. With all these handicaps, however, some farmers seem to manage their labor problems quite successfully. The explanation of their success, as the discussion of specific cases in the next section will show, does not depend exclusively on wages or other material benefits.

III

Summaries of Selected Interviews

Dairy Farms

DAIRYING IS THE MOST IMPORTANT farm enterprise in New York State. Farm wholesale cash receipts from the sale of milk amounted to \$468 million in 1965, about 50 percent of total farm cash receipts. In addition to milk sold wholesale, New York dairymen received income from the sale of butterfat, calves and cull cows, and retail milk, which boosted total receipts to over \$500 million that year.

Between 1945 and 1965 the number of dairy farms in New York State dropped from about 100,000 to 30,000, but the number of cows declined only from 1.3 million to 1.1 million. During the same period milk production per cow increased almost 60 percent, rising from 6,000 pounds to 9,500 pounds annually. Total New York State milk production consequently rose from 8 to 11 billion pounds per year in the twenty years following World War II.

In spite of the continual increase in number of cows per farm, there is still a wide disparity in farm size. The following is an estimate of the size distribution of dairy farms in New York in 1966.

Table XI: New York Dairy Farms, 1966

<i>Cows per farm</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Under 20.....	4,650	16.7
20 to 29.....	6,800	24.5
30 to 39.....	6,800	24.5
40 to 59.....	6,900	24.8
60 to 99.....	2,000	7.2
100 or more.....	650	2.3
	27,800	100.0

Source: New York State College of Agriculture, sample data (unpublished) from study conducted by Professor G. J. Conneman.

The amount of labor required on dairy farms of different sizes is indicated by the number of men working on the farms which participate in Extension Service business management projects.

*Table XII: Labor Use by Size of Farm
(673 New York Dairy Farms, 1965)*

	<i>Under 30 cows</i>	<i>30 - 39 cows</i>	<i>40 - 49 cows</i>	<i>50 - 59 cows</i>	<i>60 cows and over</i>
Number of farms ..	131	209	151	84	98
Average numbers of cows.....	25	34	44	54	82
Full-time man equi- valent per farm..	1.3	1.5	1.8	2.1	2.7
Milk sold per cow, pounds.....	11,210	11,660	12,070	11,760	12,380
Cows per man equivalent.....	19	23	24	26	30
Milk sold per man equivalent, pounds	215,600	264,300	295,100	302,300	376,000

Source: Farm Management Handbook, A. E. Ext. Paper No. 440, Department of Agricultural Economics, Cornell University (processed).

The same source provides information on the relation between wage rates, labor income of the farm operator, and labor efficiency.

*Table XIII: Relationship of Monthly Wage Rates to Various Management Factors
(760 New York Farms, 1965)*

<i>Wage rate per month</i>	<i>Proportion of farms</i>	<i>Milk sold per man equivalent</i>	<i>Labor income per operator</i>
	<i>percent</i>	<i>pounds</i>	
Less than \$150.....	20	265,400	\$4,596
\$150 to \$199.....	15	278,000	4,721
\$200 to \$249.....	19	269,800	4,883
\$250 to \$299.....	18	284,800	5,481
\$300 and over.....	28	317,900	6,039

Source: Farm Management Handbook, A. E. Ext. Paper No. 440, Department of Agricultural Economics, Cornell University (processed).

Most of the farms in this group used less than the equivalent of two full-time men throughout the year. On most farms the operator

and his family supplied a large proportion of this manpower. The number of cows cared for by one man increased from nineteen on the smaller farms to thirty on the larger dairy farms. This, combined with higher rates of milk production, resulted in substantially larger sales of milk per man equivalent on the larger farms.

When dairy farms in the management project were sorted by wage rates, the farms with higher wages were found also to have somewhat higher sales of milk per man and provide a larger labor income (net return less an allowance for capital investment) to the farm operator. Unfortunately, in this relationship it is not possible to determine which is the cause and which the effect.

This general information about trends in the dairy industry of the state and its use of manpower were taken into account in deciding which farms should be included in this study. It was recognized, however, that it would be impossible in a few interviews to get a truly representative picture of the entire industry. The next section provides a brief summary of interviews with two farm operators and two employees on the general topic of worker-management relations and related matters.

Farm No. 19

THE FARM BUSINESS. Farm No. 19 includes about 900 acres of land, of which approximately half is tillable. The major enterprise is a dairy herd of 180 cows milking, producing an average in 1965 of 11,900 pounds. The herd is housed in a new free stall barn with milking parlor. The operator has recently switched from a basically dry hay feeding program to a 70 percent silage program.

THE FARM OPERATOR. Mr. S is married and has five children. He has worked on this farm since graduation from college in 1950, first for his father and then since 1957 in partnership with him. The original farm has been expanded by the purchase of additional land.

Mr. S is active in the local Chamber of Commerce as well as in farm organizations.

THE LABOR FORCE. Although Mr. S is a partner with his father, Mr. S takes the leadership role in management decisions. His father helps with some of the farm work. There are three full-time hired men, and, in the summer, some part-time help is hired. Employee A has worked on the farm about fifteen years, Employee B four years, and Employee C for one month.

Mrs. S keeps the books and writes the checks.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION. Recruiting is carried out by ads in the local paper, through the Extension Service, or by word of mouth. The last man hired is a brother of one of the other employees and heard about the job through him. Mr. S has not used the New York State Employment Service.

In recruiting employees Mr. S relies on his local reputation and stresses the highly mechanized business, paid vacation, and pay. Mr. S relies heavily on personal interview in selection, but also checks references. He weighs the decision more carefully when he is providing housing. He would like to hire skilled help but finds this increasingly difficult and says he does not mind doing some training himself. His regular help has stayed with him an average of about four or five years. The shorter hours required in non-farm industry give Mr. S the greatest concern about retaining help.

WAGES, HOURS, AND BENEFITS. Employee A is paid \$100 per week and receives a house and utilities. Employee B is paid \$92 per week and also receives a house and utilities. Employee C is paid \$109 per week without housing. All employees are covered by Workmen's Compensation and Social Security and receive free milk. The usual working day is from 5:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. with one-half to three-quarters of an hour for breakfast and an hour for lunch. Overtime after 6:00 p.m. is paid for at \$1.50 per hour. The men work alternate Sundays, have one week of vacation with pay, and are allowed up to two weeks sick leave each year. A bonus plan based on milk production was provided a few years ago, but according to Mr. S it did not work because of the individuals involved.

Mr. S is considering offering his employees a hospitalization plan under the sponsorship of the Dairymen's League. He says the only reason he has not done it so far is that they are covered through their wives who work on a part-time basis.

EMPLOYEES' RESPONSIBILITIES. Employee A operates the field equipment and carries out the necessary maintenance on it. He runs the field chopper and self-unloading wagon continuously when putting up grass silage. He supervises the other employees when Mr. S and his father are not available.

Employee B is called the herdsman, although Mr. S makes the decisions on feeding levels and other matters concerning the milking herd. Both employees B and C work primarily in the barn and only do field work as time permits.

On bringing employees into management decisions Mr. S said:

An example was this spring when we had to decide as to whether to buy a silo or buy a baler and wagons for drawing hay, and I put it to them. I had made up my mind, myself, that the silo was the right move, but I asked them. I think if the laborers had said "No, we don't want to work with silos," then I probably would have gone to a baler and wagons. This was an easier way to do it for them too—the way we finally did it.

SUPERVISION AND TRAINING. When asked how he supervises his men Mr. S said:

General directions where I feel they have enough knowledge of the particular job at hand. Specific directions when the job is different or new, or has some detail that I want carried out. This is probably the place that's hardest to do and do it right—to communicate clearly with the help—because what you think they automatically understand maybe they don't or vice versa. The inflection in your voice, or what the difference in a word means to them compared to what it means to you. I try to discuss the job, and I try to take advantage of their ideas on the matter. To get the calibre of help that we're trying to get, they've got to think or they are not happy. I mean these men are of the calibre that should "use their heads" quite a bit, and when they don't, they're not happy where they are.

Mr. S said that in hiring and supervising an employee:

I operate under the premise that when you hire a man you try to appraise him and offer the sort of salary he would be happy with, and you try to create the situation where he can generate sufficient income for you to justify the salary.

EMPLOYER CONCERNS. When asked about the typical full-time men in his area Mr. S said they were men with farm backgrounds who liked farm work, had skills to do other work if they chose, and had high school or almost high school education. Some had one or two years beyond high school in technical schools such as Alfred or Cobleskill.

On major problems in the next five years Mr. S said:

The major problem is going to be having a size operation and business so that we can get the output per man to justify the wages that they are going to demand. These good men are going to have to milk roughly 100 cows apiece if you are going to pay them the kind of wages they can get in industry, so you have got to have a sizable operation.

EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES AND ASPIRATIONS. Employee B is 41 years old, married with four children. He completed eight years of school and has not had any vocational training. He has been working on dairy farms for twenty years, and has never had a full-time non-farm job.

He said he liked farming, especially working with cows. He thinks of himself as the assistant herdsman, is satisfied with his job, and thinks this is a pleasant place to work, but he would like additional training. He left his previous job because it was a poultry farm run by two brothers; he didn't like chickens or having two bosses.

He said his family was very satisfied with farm life, and his wife liked living in the country. At times, however, his wife got very dissatisfied because of his long working hours.

Farm No. 28

THE FARM BUSINESS. Farm No. 28 is a dairy farm with 54 cows milked in 1965, an increase of 32 since 1960. The farm operator owns 220 acres and rents an additional 30. There is a new barn, built since 1960, and a bulk milk tank. Land, buildings, and equipment are valued at about \$50,000, against which there is indebtedness of about \$30,000.

THE FARM OPERATOR. Mr. B is married and has two children, both girls. The farm is his sole source of income. He did not grow up on a farm, and has had several farm and non-farm jobs. He has operated this farm since 1956. He is a member of the Extension Service and Farm Bureau.

THE LABOR FORCE. Mr. B employed one full-time, year-round man and in past summers has employed two high school or college students. Neither his wife nor children do any of the farm work.

Employee Q, the regular employee, was hired in February, 1966. He was about 20 years old, married, with two children. He was raised on a farm and completed grade 10. He has worked as an employee on one other farm, and also in a local factory.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION. Mr. B has only used full-time help for the past five years, but during that time has had three different men. He was without regular help for two and a half months before the present man was hired.

Mr. B has secured help by placing an ad in the local paper and an order with the Employment Service. He was quite satisfied with his experience with this agency.

Employee Q heard about this job through his brother, who considered it but did not take it. Mr. Q left his former job to take this one because he said his employer was never around to work with him, and the house he lived in was too close to his wife's relatives.

In recruiting, Mr. B says he stresses that the work on this farm is relatively easy because of the mechanization, and that the pay is good. He looks for good recommendations and experience, although he is willing to take someone without experience and train him. He says he is really looking for someone interested in farming that he could hire for several years and then work into a partnership. He has asked his County Agent to help him find such a person. So far he has not found anyone he would consider capable enough.

WAGES, HOURS, AND PRIVILEGES. Employee Q is paid \$60 per week and provided a house. The employer pays the heating bill and one-fourth of the electric bill. Employee Q has permission to use up to four quarts of milk per day. He is provided Social Security and Workmen's Compensation, and insurance through an Agway Health Insurance Plan. Mr. B estimated the total value of the wages and privileges at \$90 per week, while Employee Q said he and his wife estimated it at \$100.

Usual working hours for the employee were from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. with an hour off for both breakfast and lunch, and, when possible, a half hour off in the afternoon before milking. Employee Q gets every second Sunday off, and works four to five hours on the alternate Sundays. He has most Saturday afternoons off. There is no specific understanding about sick pay, but Employee Q has been off sick without any pay deduction.

Employee Q says in the six months he has worked on the farm he has worked three evenings without receiving extra pay. There is no bonus or incentive pay.

EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITIES. Mr. B stated that with previous employees he had generally shared the work "fifty-fifty," and both together had fed and milked cows, cleaned the barn, and done other chores. Mr. B did not feel his present employee was capable of milking cows, and restricted him to washing the cows, cleaning the barn, and other routine jobs.

Mr. B has let his employee do minor repairs on machinery. Mr. B said that Employee Q was constantly tearing down cars and putting them together with the help of his father.

Mr. B did not think his employee was capable of running the farm in his absence.

SUPERVISION AND TRAINING. Mr. B stated that he was always willing to show his employees how to do farm jobs or train them if they were willing to take an interest. In the past he has taken them to Extension meetings if they were interested in this sort of thing. He has even taken some of his part-time summer help to such meetings. He does not feel his present employee is interested.

Mr. B said he supervises his men through general directions unless he does not feel they can handle certain jobs, and then he goes through specific assignments. He tells this employee what to do, because when he has tried to discuss the job with Mr. Q and decide mutually on assignments he has gotten no response.

Mr. B was asked whether he thought the employee had a better chance of getting a job on another farm because of the skills acquired on this farm. He said that the employee may have learned something but his basic attitude has not changed and therefore, although he may have increased his chance of getting a job, he probably has not increased his chance of keeping it.

EMPLOYER CONCERNS. Mr. B has encountered problems in recruiting full-time, year-round men. He feels it is hard to hold full-time men because of the long hours and the six-day week. He does not feel this is due to pay, since he believes the pay is comparable to wages in other industries if traveling time, benefits, etc., are considered.

Mr. B feels it is getting more difficult to hire full-time men than it was in the past. He does not feel he has any direct competition from other farmers or from industries in the area.

In Mr. B's opinion the average year-round farm employee in his area is a drifter, has dropped out of high school, has no ambition, is likely to end up on welfare rolls, and has no purpose in life.

EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES AND ASPIRATIONS. Employee Q said he liked farm work, found it easier than his previous factory job, and preferred having only one boss. He was raised on a farm and said he hopes to own his own farm some day. He thought, generally speaking, that farmers were good employers, and that he works closely with the present farm operator.

Nevertheless, in the previous month Employee Q missed a couple of days without any excuse and arrived for work late on several occasions.

Supplementary Information on Labor Practices on Other Dairy Farms

THE FARMS. The dairy farms in the study ranged in size from 36 to 209 cows milked and had gross earnings from \$25,000 to

\$110,000 per year. With the exception of two farms, almost all income was from the sale of milk and related products such as calves and, in one case, wheat. One of the other two farmers reported 15 percent of the gross from an apple orchard, and the other 50 percent from field crops and vegetables. Indebtedness per farm operation varied between "relatively free" and \$200,000.

THE OPERATORS. Nearly all of the dairy farms studied were operated by their owners. All operators were men with farm backgrounds; only three of them reported ever having had full-time employment in non-farm occupations. One of these had been an Assistant County Agent and another had worked in livestock sales. The third farm operator who had non-farm work experience had been employed in a bank. Of the eight operators giving their educational background, four had college degrees (one a Master's degree), two had two years beyond high school, and two had completed high school. Only one owner-operator belonged to no organizations. The others were all members of the Extension Service and Grange or Farm Bureau, as well as of other farm and non-farm organizations. Ages of operators, when reported, were mostly under fifty. All but one of the operators was married and had children.

LABOR FORCE. On the ten farms where the cash income was entirely from milk and related products, all but one used only year-round workers. The number of full-time employees varied from one to six. It was difficult to determine from the information available to what extent the size of the operation, the capabilities of the workers, and the amount of labor contributed by members of the family influenced the number of men hired.

Year-round, part-time help (as well as full-time in some cases) was furnished by members of the operators' families on eight farms. The jobs they did ranged from running errands and helping with the chores to assuming certain managerial responsibilities. In most cases women contributed by keeping books. On seven farms, students or boys from the neighborhood worked part-time all year; in one case, two students were employed in the summer only.

The dairy farm reporting the 15 percent of its gross income from apples and the one where a large part of the cash income was from field crops employed seasonal help. The operators of the latter used local and migrant laborers during busy seasons, some of whom worked under crew leaders.

From these interviews the pattern of the work week on dairy farms appeared to be approximately nine, ten, or eleven hours each week day;

five to six hours on Sundays (and sometimes on Saturdays); every other Sunday and holiday off; shorter hours in winter than in summer. An indication of the length of the workweek was contained in one report which stated that overtime was paid after sixty hours a week. Concern about the long hours was expressed by operators and workers in their answers to questions relating to farm labor problems.

WAGES AND BENEFITS. Year-round, full-time employees were generally furnished houses and maintenance. Cash wages ranged from \$50 a week (for the "hired man" too old to do a full day's work) to \$100 a week. An exception to this range was the \$25 per week paid each of three full-time, unmarried men who received board from the farmer as well as housing. Estimates on total wages (cash wages and housing) ranged from \$150 a week down to \$105; the elderly hired man mentioned above received a total of \$80 a week.

Fringe benefits varied from farm to farm. All employees were reported to be covered by Social Security and Workmen's Compensation. Four employers, in addition, paid for life insurance plans or health and accident insurance, or both. One employer paid both halves of Social Security. Many employers furnished not only milk for the worker's family but also some meat each year. In seven cases sick leave and/or paid vacations were listed. One employee reported to have over-used sick leave was being docked \$10 a day for days absent beyond the one-week sick leave allowed. Payments for overtime were reported for six farms; four of them paid on an hourly rate of \$1.25 to \$2.00, the other reported paying for extra time in a lump sum.

INCENTIVES AND BONUSES. Although most operators reported giving gifts to keep employees happy, relatively few reported regular bonuses. One employer reported the salaries he paid "plus a little for good will." A "profit sharing and pension plan" was provided by one employer for regular employees who were over twenty-five years of age and had worked for him at least three years. According to the terms of this plan an employee "has no vested rights for five years, but after that can obtain 50 percent of the total and after ten years can take any of it." According to the operator, all the employees valued the plan, although recently three workers had taken jobs in industry after five to eight years on his farm. By leaving the farm at this point, the workers had left behind \$1,000, \$1,200, and \$1,500 respectively. A "bonus" reported by one operator was the payment of dues in Farm Bureau and Extension Service for an employee.

RECRUITMENT. In general, help has been recruited through ads in newspapers, word of mouth, and personal contacts. Only two opera-

tors reported the Employment Service as helpful. One of them felt that he had a good relationship with the Farm Employment Representative and that the Service had many applicants for farm work. ("I was satisfied with the employment agency. I wasn't satisfied with the help.") One operator gave as his reason for not using the Service that "Usually a man of any value doesn't have to go to the employment office to find a good job." Several others reported using local employment services and in one case the Extension Service. The points these farmers made in order to attract help were: the "modern" aspect of the operation, wages, housing, fringe benefits, and, in a number of cases, the "reputation" of the farm or farmer. An example of the last is the farmer who said that he stressed high mechanization, paid vacations, the farm's reputation and then added, "I put my name on the ad."

EDUCATION AND BACKGROUND OF EMPLOYEES. All employees interviewed were full-time workers, and all came from farm backgrounds. Several reported previous experience on dairy farms and one of them was formerly the owner of a dairy farm. Six of the employees were under thirty years of age, one was thirty-four, and three were between forty and fifty. Half of the men interviewed had not completed high school, one had completed high school, one had two years of college (and vocational education for four years), and another was planning to continue his college education.

With the exception of one employee who had had vocational training in agriculture, all employees had been trained on the job in present or previous situations. There appeared to be no formal training programs on the farms visited. Very few employers provided any incentive for employees to take training and generally assumed that they were "always training." One operator saw the training he did as "on-the-job orientation." One owner claimed that he would send herdsmen for formal training if it was available nearer than the Midwest.

Many employees felt they knew all they needed to know, but a few would have liked more training. One hired man expressed a wish for training in cattle breeding and machinery; another would have liked more training if he could have gotten it without interfering with the job.

SUPERVISION. Most employees on the dairy farms visited were given job assignments and supervised by one person. In some instances responsibilities may have been shared by senior employees or another member of the family partnership. From the selection of choices given to farmers for indicating supervisory procedures, it appears that supervision was informal and relaxed because of the amount of time employer and employees worked together. Decisions on how jobs should

be carried out, as well as the settlement of misunderstandings, seemed mostly to be handled by "talking it over." The operators stressed "don't chew anybody out," "don't fly off the handle," and "cool down first." Some different points of view on decision making and how to settle misunderstandings were: one, make a "matter-of-fact statement and let it go at that...most smart enough...they feel bad enough anyway;" two, discussion was tried, but employee didn't respond; three, to cut employee "down to size" seemed to be necessary and successful, but after rather than before an important task was done because the employee was naturally disappointed by the reprimand.

TURNOVER AND REPLACEMENT. The dairy farmers interviewed did not report turnover as a serious problem at that time. The most recently employed worker had been on the farm for about a year and a half. Other workers averaged about four years on their present jobs. One full-time man who had been with the same farmer for five years indicated that he was planning to leave as soon as possible.

Most of the dairy farmers agreed that it was generally more difficult to hire skilled than unskilled men, and that it was, and will continue to be, more difficult to find full-time men. The majority of reasons given for this relate to competition from industry which offers higher pay, prestige, and shorter hours. The last two of these attractions from industry were said to be closely tied to values imposed by employees' wives and families. A farmer in central New York gave a different reason, i.e., today's "non-incentive" philosophy that you will be taken care of whether you work or not. Another farmer said: "There are few people who want to farm," and, as evidence, he pointed out that his local high school had not had an agricultural course in the last three years. Despite these general views of a decreasing supply of farm labor, all but one of these farmers said they are not yet feeling a shortage. Any competition for skilled or full-time help was said to be from industry (but only indirectly) and from other farmers, especially from "outsiders" who could offer shorter hours and partnership opportunities.

PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RELATIONS. All but three employers reported a great number of "socializing" activities between themselves, their employees, and their families. "Treating an employee as part of the family" for one employer does not include joint social activity. The employee in this particular case complained about the employer's interference in his personal life. The employer said he showed his interest by encouraging employees to engage in church and community activities.

Employees and employers did not always agree about what was meant by their doing things together or their families doing things together. For example, the hired man of an operator, who reported no socializing between the families, felt that his family and the boss's family were close and cited the fact that the children played together and that he was giving the employer's son guitar lessons. Another example of different interpretations was the case of the employer who reported sharing many social activities and interests with the employee; the employee said that their families were close but that the employer should take a personal interest in him. He was not sure to what extent this would be good.

All employers indicated that what the employee did off the job was his own business, qualified, in most instances, by "as long as it doesn't interfere with his work" and the employee is "respectable, pays bills, and does not lead undesirable kind of life."

Showing interest in giving help with personal affairs of employees was reported by most operators. The ways in which they did so included babysitting, exchanging gifts, and loaning money and equipment. "Personal interest can be carried too far" said one operator who no longer makes loans or advances because of unfortunate past experiences. Many examples of good or poor ways of handling worker-management relations concerned help with personal affairs.

LABOR RELATIONS. When asked what they thought made for good or poor labor relations on the farm and what advice they would give if asked, employers and employees agreed about most policies and practices involved. Workers more often expressed their dissatisfactions with jobs they had moved from rather than with their present employment. Employers spoke almost exclusively of the employee's role in the job picture, just as the employees directed their remarks to what the boss should do. One farmer did stipulate that employees should avoid talking outside about the farm. One employee said that bad relations result when the farmer hires inferior help "because they just try to get something out of nothing." Another employee went so far as to say that an "employee has certain obligations, too" and that, for example, he should give notice before he quits.

Although many from each group mentioned the importance of good wages and living conditions, only one employer and one employee felt that these were the most important factors. In fact, employers mentioned these factors more frequently than did employees. Employers also were more concerned than their help with such things as paid vacations, good equipment, profit-sharing and pension plans, and long

work hours. In regard to long hours, one employer said, "The time off deal is the thing that bothers me more than anything else. I'd like to pay more, and pay is easier for them to get than time off. . . . They're not worried about the pay. They're worried about time off to do things." The remarks of the employee on this same farm confirmed what the farmer said, but, interestingly enough, when asked what the farmer did that made him especially like this job, he replied that it was the fact that the employer asked his advice when the employer felt he had special knowledge to offer.

Other suggestions for holding an employee and establishing good working relationships on the farm included keeping the employees' wives happy (especially in regard to hours and housing); not having too many bosses (in at least two cases operators spoke about their own problems with family members); "not chewing out the help" and other variations on the theme of the personality of the boss; and willingness of the operator to share the work (obviously behavior highly valued by many of the employees). The following summary is from an interview with an employer described by his employee as an exceptionally good boss: "The key is the observance of the Golden Rule and good pay, conditions, hours, housing, adapting the man to the job, appreciating workers' point of view, and not getting upset." His suggestion to other employers was that they develop a good reputation, train themselves and their employees in management, provide more specific jobs, and expand the size of their operations so that hours of work could be made "competitively attractive."

Fruit and Vegetable Farms

New York's 4,359 commercial fruit and vegetable farms made up less than 8 percent of its 56,760 commercial farms at the time of the 1959 U.S. Census of Agriculture. They accounted, however, for 22 percent of the total cash outlay for hired labor made by the state's commercial farms in 1959.

Between 1959 and 1964 the total number of fruit farms in the state remained quite stable (2,694 in 1959 and 2,639 in 1964), but the number of vegetable farms decreased from 1,665 to 1,430. The acreage in nearly all types of vegetables, except for snap beans, cabbage, dry onions, lettuce, and celery, also decreased in the five-year period. A decrease in trees of bearing age was also reported for most kinds of fruit trees except for pears and sweet cherries. Grape vines of bearing age changed little in number.

Information about the number of workers employed on fruit and

vegetable farms is not available on a year-round basis. The census data indicate that these farms hire a small fraction of the regularly employed farm workers (150 days of employment or more) and a much larger proportion of seasonal workers. The census figures suggest that the employment of five or more hired workers is far more frequent on fruit and vegetable farms than on most other types of farms, but the figures do not adequately reflect the seasonal peaks, especially for harvesting.

Recent advances in mechanization have reduced the total labor requirements on fruit and vegetable farms. The bean harvester is an outstanding example of a major labor-saving, labor-displacing piece of equipment which has been rapidly adopted. Devices which eliminate hand picking of cherries and apples have been developed to the point where adoption by farmers is beginning. Many production operations on most fruit and vegetable farms continue, however, to require hand labor, especially at harvest time.

Five farms in the study were devoted exclusively to vegetable growing; five were devoted exclusively to fruit; one produced both fruit and vegetables; one was a dairy-fruit enterprise; and two were dairy-vegetable farms. These farms were distributed among the principal fruit and vegetable producing areas of the state except for Long Island. Two vegetable and two fruit enterprises were selected for description here because they show some of the major variations found in labor arrangements. Worker interviews on four additional farms throw additional light on problems and practices.

Farm No. 18

THE FARM. Farm No. 18 grows a variety of vegetables for fresh market. Nearly all of the 400-acre farm, mostly in crops, is owned by the operator. Capital investment currently approximates \$500,000; the gross farm income in 1965 was \$250,000. Major labor-saving devices such as mechanical harvesters and bigger equipment for fitting ground have been added during the last five years.

THE OPERATOR. This farm is operated by a father (Mr. X) and three adult sons; the father is the over-all boss.

LABOR FORCE AND LABOR FORCE ORGANIZATION. The major managerial tasks are divided among the father and three sons; one son specializes in selling and the other two concentrate on farm operations.

There are three full-time, year-round employees. The top man (Mr. B thinks of himself as foreman. Mr. B has been on this farm about

eighteen years; he started as a teamster when the farm still had horses. He is 45 years old and is married with five children. Raised on a farm, he has a high school education plus some business college courses and vocational agricultural education for two years at night school. He has been a farm owner himself and has had one full-time, non-farm job in the past. Two of his school-age sons do some work on this farm for pay; the other three children are too young. This top man is basically a mechanic and maintenance man but also bosses a crew, sprays, plants, and cultivates.

The second year-round man is primarily a machine operator and has been on the job about ten years; he came from Europe and from a different type of farming. The third man is in his first year on this farm and is an experienced worker; he is a retired farmer who sold his farm.

An average of about twenty-eight people are employed much of the year, with numbers ranging from six to sixty. Contract⁹ Puerto Ricans — males only — are employed for five to seven months; fourteen were employed in 1966. In addition to the Puerto Ricans, three types of local seasonal workers are used: one, local women (7 currently); two, Negro and white workers from a nearby city who drive their own cars and go home at night; and, three, high school students (about eight). Some of the local seasonal workers come in five days a week for about 36 weeks a year.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION. If in need of a full-time, year-round employee, "we usually call the Employment Service." "We've had pretty good men" through the Employment Service. Mr. B, however, was recruited directly by Mr. X after he had sold his farm and moved back to the area. "He hadn't even unpacked his belongings when Mr. X came to see him and asked him if he would work for him." In hiring a year-round man, emphasis is placed on his experience and on the interview with him. "I like to see them have a little education — at least a high school education or more." Workers should be concerned with what income they will get and with security, but Mr. X believes "There's not much incentive" to attract anybody to farm work.

WAGES, HOURS, AND PRIVILEGES. Mr. X tries to pay according to the wage scale of the area and somewhat on the basis of the quality of the work. Of the year-round workers, the one that has been there the longest gets the most pay.

The top man (Mr. B) now receives \$120 a week base pay for sixty

⁹ These are workers whose terms of employment are fixed by an agreement between a representative of the Puerto Rican government and the farmer.

hours of work — a \$5 increase over last year. If he works over sixty hours a week, he gets time and a half for overtime. During the marketing season, he usually works six days a week and Sunday mornings; the rest of the year he works six days a week. About eight months of the year the weekday hours are 7:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. with an hour off at noon. During the other four months the hours are 7:30-5:30. He gets two weeks' vacation with pay and receives Christmas, New Year's Day, and Thanksgiving off. He gets time and a half for Sunday work, Memorial Day, the Fourth of July, and Labor Day. He has his Blue Cross and Blue Shield paid, is covered by Workmen's Compensation, gets all the vegetables he wants, and has use of equipment from the farm. He gets full pay when sick. There is not any systematic bonus or incentive program, but this man usually receives a bonus each year averaging between \$250 and \$300, although one year it was \$400. Mr. B estimates the total value of his fringe benefits at about \$50 per month, and the total of wages and all benefits amount to approximately \$590 a month.

The machine operator receives \$85 a week plus Blue Cross, Blue Shield, Workmen's Compensation, two weeks' vacation with pay, time and a half for overtime, and pay while sick.

The new year-round experienced laborer receives \$2.10 per hour, with provision for overtime but none of the other fringe benefits. Although counted as a full-time, year-round man, he works only as much as he wants to.

Puerto Ricans are paid \$1.15 per hour plus a bonus of 5¢ to 20¢ per hour based on years of experience and ability. They also receive transportation from Puerto Rico to the farm, housing in a registered labor camp, blankets, and other perquisites. Total costs to the employer are estimated at around \$1.75 per hour. The local women are paid \$1.50 per hour; the "day haul" workers from the nearby city are all on piece rates. The starting wage for the high school students depends on their age; those fourteen get \$1.00 per hour and those sixteen start at \$1.20 per hour. All workers are furnished with "a lot of rain-suits, gloves, boots and that stuff when the weather isn't good and we need to work."

EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITIES. All of the year-round employees, and especially the senior man, supervise crews of seasonal workers, including Puerto Ricans. Mr. B is responsible for fixing the machinery, and this is his major wintertime duty. This senior man also sprays and does greenhouse and field operations. The year-round men keep their eyes open for diseases and other problems, but they are not to do more

than report findings; one son is responsible for taking action on these problems.

Seasonal workers are assigned day by day, according to the job to be done and the skill required. For example, "We have a certain group that we know can handle a new melon job better than the rest." "It doesn't take quite as much experience to pick corn — there's a lot of high school boys working along with the Puerto Ricans on that."

TRAINING, SUPERVISION, AND MANAGEMENT. This employer does not think of himself as running a formal training program for his workers. "We have to train them ourselves, just as industry does." The father and two of the sons exercise daily, detailed supervision, each man working with a certain crop or a certain group of workers on any given day. The year-round men get assignments each day, "usually in the morning and once again at noon." The top man gets general directions unless he is supposed to spray, and then he gets detailed instructions.

For the seasonal workers, the father and two sons begin by telling them how the work is to be done. "Normally we go out and do the job ourselves and tell them to look real close — observe." Then they start the workers. "If you bring a new man here, it costs you a lot of labor no matter what the job is, because it takes him so long before he becomes experienced enough to make progress." If the workers are inexperienced, their work is checked several times a day "as much as you have time to." The year-round men are not checked on at all. Usually, in the case of the Puerto Ricans, one experienced worker tells the others. If they understand English, the employers try to do the training directly.

If the workers do something wrong, or if there is a misunderstanding, the technique is to try to handle it diplomatically. "Did I tell you wrong, or did you misunderstand me? What did I tell you?" Mr. X says, "I don't think you should go out and hoot at them." With the Puerto Ricans, "You can coax a lot out of them by being decent with them. If you try to push them around, you're done."

The owners work with the laborers all of the time; they do not give an assignment and then go and sit down. They do not ask employees to do work which they would not themselves do; "A lot of times we do jobs that we know they don't like to do, because we don't want to aggravate them."

The top year-round man is often asked for suggestions when something is to be built, repaired, or remodeled. "He's working for you all the time. When he makes a suggestion, he thinks it's a good one."

The year-round men, especially Mr. B, are taken to the winter school

programs on vegetables and different functions such as those run by the Extension Service. Also, "We used to subscribe to some farm papers for them."

Mr. X believes the factors for success in retaining good farm employees are salaries, privileges, security, compatability, responsibility, and not "shoving all the hard work on them."

This employer thinks it is better to raise workers' salaries before they ask. Also, "Try to pay them for every hour that they work." He believes in taking a personal interest in the employees; for example, "If their kids have a graduation, give them a graduation gift." But, "It's their own business what they do when they're off the place."

This employer no longer provides housing for married men; the men would "rather have the extra pay and go live in the houses they want to."

FARM OPERATOR CONCERNS. Looking ahead, Mr. X feels that the major problems in labor in the next five years will be unions, and "There isn't a darn thing you can do." In his opinion, wages paid in industry and the security offered by industry are making it more difficult to hire full-time men than in the past. This is especially true of skilled farm help. Obtaining full-time skilled farm help will be more difficult in the future unless farmers offer them some additional incentives.

EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES AND ASPIRATIONS. The year-round top man said that he was looking for dependability and security in a job, and his present employer had a reputation of being "a good man to work for." He feels he is treated decently, and the operation is small enough so that "You're an individual, not just a number like you are in industry." He likes to discuss new practices or new machinery which he feels will be beneficial to the farm and feels he makes decisions on his own. He appreciates having his pay raised without this being requested and appreciated his employer's sending flowers to him while he was in the hospital. This worker prefers higher wages rather than fringe benefits. One problem is long hours; his wife feels that he doesn't spend enough time at home with the children.

In this worker's view, employers should explain the work in detail so there is no question as to what is to be done. Too much should not be expected from people not familiar with the work until they are properly trained. Employers should use decent language and not cuss or swear at their men. This, in his opinion, is one of the biggest factors making for bad relationships on farms. Employers should also have

confidence in their men and not "watch them every minute." Mr. B is paid weekly, and the employer has never missed a payday.

Mr. B likes the open air, loves to watch plants grow and likes experimenting. The only thing he does not like is the fall work during the rainy, cold period. If he were to change jobs it would be only to go into farming for himself, but so far he hasn't been able to get the financing needed.

Farm No. 8

THE FARM. Celery, lettuce, and onions are the major crops on this 700 acre farm, most of which is owned by the operator. Total capital investment is over \$1,000,000 and the gross farm income in 1965 was slightly under \$1,000,000.

THE OPERATOR. The farm is run by two brothers. One has charge of sales and shipping, the other has charge of the farm operations. The interview was with the partner in charge of the farm operations (Mr. Y). He is farm-reared but has had experience with several full-time, non-farm jobs in the past.

LABOR FORCE AND LABOR FORCE ORGANIZATION. The major managerial decisions on the farm, including labor management, are the responsibility of Mr. Y. His wife does some work part-time with the seasonal workers. Several of his children do work on the farm, and one son and one daughter help supervise the seasonal labor crews.

Typically, there are thirty-five to forty full-time, year-round employees, of whom three are capable of running the farm in the temporary absence of the operator; these three have essentially foreman roles. About 130 contract Puerto Rican men are employed for six months of the year. At the peak period, an additional twenty Puerto Ricans are employed for thirty days. There are two Puerto Rican foremen among the seasonal workers. During the summer, ten to fifteen high school students are employed in packing operations.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION. In recruiting year-round employees, men with training are preferred, for all the year-round workers are required to have more skill than the seasonal workers. Men able to handle labor crews are the most difficult to get. The main factor considered in selection is recommendations from other farms for which a man has worked. Most of the year-round, full-time employees are recruited from walk-ins who came because of the reputation of the farm. The Employment Service has been used, but it has been difficult to get steady help from this source. The long distance of the farm from

the nearest town and the lack of transportation for the workers referred by the Employment Service may explain the problem of recruiting through this agency.

Special attention is given to the recruitment and selection of the seasonal Puerto Rican workers. Extensive work productivity records and observations of each laborer's relations with other workers are kept. At the end of the season, each worker's record is reviewed to determine whether or not he will be asked to return for the following year. The workers selected to return are asked to seek out other Puerto Ricans for the next year.

WAGES, HOURS, AND PRIVILEGES. Year-round workers are paid according to the quality of the work they do. Incentive and bonus plans are used. The year-round employees work nine to fourteen hours a day, seven days a week, during the harvest periods. At other seasons they usually work a nine-hour day.

The Puerto Rican seasonal workers are paid by the hour under contract. Hourly wages average about \$1.25, including the end-of-season bonus, but the estimated total cost per hour, including housing and other non-wage benefits, to the employer is \$1.50.

TRAINING, SUPERVISION, AND MANAGEMENT. New year-round employees are trained informally if they lack required skills, and continuing employees are trained as needed to supplement the skills they already have. The year-round employees receive general directions from the operator. Seasonal workers are divided into several work units. Individual workers are moved from group to group to make sure the jobs are done in the best manner possible and to determine with which group and which crew leader the individual works best. The crew leaders of the seasonal workers are given general directions, and they in turn give individual workers more specific assignments. Some of the year-round workers do some supervising, principally of the seasonal workers. One daughter also helps with the supervision of the seasonal workers by giving directions to the Puerto Rican crew leaders; the Puerto Rican workers were not willing to take orders from a woman directly.

Mr. Y spends full time with his employees, although he does not do the manual work. The top, year-round workers and the crew leaders are encouraged to give suggestions as to how to do jobs. If there is a dangerous job to be done, this operator does it himself, for he feels he should never ask his men to do anything that he would not do.

This employer believes he should take a personal interest in his year-round employees but avoid getting too involved in their personal

affairs. He frequently associates with them, takes them to various kinds of meetings, and spends leisure time with them. What the year-round employees do off the farm is their business.

Mr. Y feels that the main factor in retaining year-round employees is that they like their work. He considers seasonal labor more of a problem than the year-round labor. Mr. Y talks to all of the seasonal workers about their problems. He makes visits to Puerto Rico once or twice a year to the families of the workers and takes them gifts — a practice which is apparently welcomed by the workers.

It is anticipated that more Puerto Rican family groups will be coming in the future. One problem will be to provide housing for families. Mr. Y believes the future tendency will be to provide more work during the year for seasonal workers through greenhouse operations, double cropping, and other practices. Currently an attempt is being made to provide employment through farm maintenance and improvement activities when major crops are not being harvested.

FARM OPERATOR CONCERNS. It has been getting more difficult to hire full-time men than in the past and more difficult to find skilled than unskilled men. This operator believes, however, that such workers will be more readily available in the future because the enterprise is expanding and will be able to offer better conditions of work. Competition from other farmers is for the seasonal workers rather than for the year-round workers, and takes the form of higher wages for short-term jobs.

Farm No. 14

THE FARM. The 180 acres of Farm No. 14 are devoted exclusively to apple production. Most of the farm is owned and was purchased without buildings in the 1940's for \$350 per acre. Some acreage is now being sold off for building lots at \$750 to \$800 per acre. Capital investments include expenditures of over \$50,000 to convert to bulk bins and the addition of controlled atmosphere storage rooms. Gross income in 1965 was around \$125,000.

THE OPERATOR. Mr. Z, the operator, has a 25-year-old son in the farm business with him. Mr. Z completed high school, spent a number of years in non-farm business for himself, and was foreman on an estate for several years before he bought his own farm.

LABOR FORCE AND LABOR FORCE ORGANIZATION. Mr. Z estimates he spends half of his time on management. His son does the same jobs that his father does but is more of a mechanic and

handles equipment maintenance. Mr. Z's wife helps during the harvest and to pack apples, if there is a shortage of labor. A son who attends college helps on the farm during the summer; the two daughters do not do any farm work.

One full-time, year-round man is employed and a second man, a Negro, is employed on a monthly basis for about six months of the year to help with spraying. Two crews totaling about thirty-five Negro interstate workers from Florida are employed seasonally in the orchard and in the packing house. The two crew leaders have been employed for about fifteen years on this farm. Seasonal workers include both men and women. A small group comes for thinning and picking early apples; they are usually on the farm eight to ten weeks. The pickers work a shorter length of time. Local women are employed in packing operations during the summer, fall, and winter, but principally during the winter.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION. The two crew leaders are primarily responsible for recruiting the interstate seasonal workers. Some crew members have been returning regularly for twelve to thirteen years. Men are preferred by Mr. Z. Puerto Ricans have been hired in the past, but he was not satisfied with their work as apple-pickers. Mr. Z joined with other growers in his area to form an association through which he received authorization for a limited number of foreign workers for the fall harvest in 1966.

Steady work, a good crop, good accommodations, good pay, and living up to your agreement are very important in attracting and keeping seasonal workers, according to Mr. Z. The latter is important in persuading laborers to return the next year. "There's nothing that will chase a migrant out any quicker than not living up to an agreement or having short crops."

WAGES, HOURS, AND PRIVILEGES. A regular worker who had been employed half of each year for twelve years was making \$1.65 an hour when he quit for a non-farm job. In addition, he had a trailer to live in and was provided free electricity and bottled gas. This man put in a 44-hour week.

The apple pickers were all on a piece-work basis at 25¢ per 1½ bushel in 1965 and 1966. This rate included an end-of-year bonus. These pickers do not work on Sunday, and many do not want to work on Saturday. It is not uncommon to have a short crew on Mondays because of weekend drinking which the crew leaders cannot control. Wages of apple thinners were raised in 1966 from \$1.15 to \$1.25 per hour; these workers usually put in fifty hours per week. Other hourly

workers among the interstate group are paid from \$1.25 to \$1.75 per hour, depending upon their skills. A fork-lift operator, for example, is worth more than an unskilled worker. In general, the objective is to pay by the quality of the individual's work rather than by the position he has. Workers are covered by Workmen's Compensation and Social Security.

Housing is supplied for the interstate workers and includes blankets, hot water, bottled gas for cooking, and wood for stoves. The total cost for hourly interstate workers is estimated at around \$1.60 per hour.

TRAINING, SUPERVISION, AND MANAGEMENT. The crew leaders are generally responsible for supervision of the interstate seasonal workers and in turn receive their instructions from Mr. Z or his son. Difficulty encountered in maintaining the quality and quantity of work is, in the opinion of the operator, associated with the shortage of available workers.

"What we try to do is keep our pay scale at a level where we can induce them to help us stay in business so they'll have a job — see that they can stay here comfortably same as if you were in a motel We talk to them and try to convince them what we have to have." If the crop is short or the fruit is small, problems arise because the pickers cannot earn what they think is a fair wage. "We have to either increase the per unit pay or give them extra tickets to bring them up to a level they've been consistently making."

FARM OPERATOR CONCERNS. This operator believes the supply of interstate seasonal labor is declining. The younger Negroes, in his view, are getting a better education and are attracted into industry where they make more money. Better jobs are available in the South than formerly. To develop mechanization on the farm as far as possible is seen by Mr. Z as the only salvation.

Mr. Z is much upset by the fact that he feels farmers are looked upon by state-level agencies, as well as by others, as people who are "just not doing what's quite right" with seasonal workers. The poor practices of one employer tend to be attributed to all farmers.

A major concern for this farmer is that in order to stay in farming he will have to relocate because of urban expansion. Not only is his land more valuable for residential than for farming purposes but, even more important, he has great problems carrying on essential production practices, such as spraying and using pesticides and mechanical equipment, on a farm surrounded by residential development.

Farm No. 17

THE FARM. Farm No. 17 encompasses about 180 acres of which 75 acres are in grapes and 20 acres are in fruit trees, principally apples and sweet cherries. The operator is also developing a nursery stock enterprise. The farm, including buildings, is valued at about \$80,000, with an additional \$15,000 in machinery and equipment. Gross farm income in 1965 amounted to about \$40,000.

THE OPERATOR. The farm is owned and operated by Mr. Q, a married man in his mid-forties, with three children, all daughters. Mr. Q completed two years of college. He is a member of, and has held offices in, several farm and non-farm organizations.

LABOR FORCE AND LABOR FORCE ORGANIZATION. Mr. Q's main tasks are management, supervision, and equipment repair. Mrs. Q supervises the women who harvest the grapes and drives a tractor; she also helps tie grapevines in the spring. The daughters do not work on the farm. There is now one full-time, year-round hired man who serves as a foreman to supervise other workers. In 1965 there were two full-time, year-round workers.

During the winter three men are hired part-time to trim the grapevines, and six or seven men are hired for the spring to pull brush and clean orchards. Two seasonal workers are hired from May to August for jobs such as hoeing. At cherry harvest time, from ten to eighteen day-haul¹⁰ Negro men from a large city are usually employed, but this year there was no crop to pick. In the fall three or four men are hired to pick apples, and fifteen to twenty local women are employed to pick grapes. Some day-haul workers and some women are also used in tying grapes.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION. The day-haul help from the city is obtained through men whom Mr. Q has used for several years as crew leaders. When help is needed, Mr. Q telephones these men who recruit the workers and transport them to the farm, and who are paid especially for this function. The women who pick grapes are obtained in somewhat the same way from a community about thirty miles from the farm. The women sometimes bring their families on weekends to help in the harvest.

There is considerable turnover from year to year among the Negro

¹⁰ Day-haul people work on a day-to-day basis. They are picked up in the city and returned to it at night.

day-haul workers, but many of the same women have picked grapes on this farm for several years. Mr. Q also said that grape trimmers are very hard to find. His present trimming staff consisted of a retired farmer and two men who work regularly on the New York State Thruway and trim in their off hours.

Mr. Q believes that wage rates are the most important factor in attracting and holding seasonal workers. Also, he is lenient on hours of work for the women, especially when they have children to consider.

WAGES, HOURS, AND PRIVILEGES. No information is available on the wages paid the regular hired man. All the other workers are paid by the hour except during harvest, when they are on piece rates. For grape harvesting the women received 32¢ per crate in 1965, but probably will receive 2¢ or 3¢ more in 1966. Workers were paid 3¢ per pound for cherries in 1965 and 5¢ for currants. The day-haul help are paid daily, but the women are paid whenever they ask for their wages.

Mr. Q believes that the women harvesting grapes can earn from \$200 to \$250 for four weeks work, averaging about \$10 to \$12 per day, and that an outstanding grape picker might earn \$18 per day. Women are allowed to work as long or as short hours as they wish. Coffee is brought to them in cold weather.

The day-haul workers and women who do grape tying are paid \$1.25 per hour, a rate believed to be about the same as that paid on nearby farms. Trimmers are started at \$1.25 per hour, usually go to \$1.50 the second year, but are paid \$2.00 per hour when fully experienced. Each employee was given a Christmas bonus in 1965, although this was not expected by the workers.

EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITIES. The regular hired man on this farm has considerable responsibility for supervising labor. He has exclusive charge of the apple operation, which involves three to four men during harvest. He also has charge of the part-time trimmers in winter and of the men who pull brush and clean the orchard in the spring. This man also supervises day-haul workers during the cherry harvest and the local women in grape picking. Mr. Q reported that his hired man was a very good supervisor.

TRAINING, SUPERVISING, AND MANAGEMENT. Although much of the supervision on this farm is left to the regular hired man, Mr. Q and his wife also have supervisory roles. Training grape trimmers, which usually takes two years, has been a major concern. Mr. Q has trained the trimmers by having the experienced men go through first to shape up the vines and then, for the first year, the new

men follow, trimming out the smaller curls and suckers. The second-year men do some trimming. Mr. Q would like to see some vocational training in this subject offered by the vo-ag department of the local high school. He said if he could get more trimmers he would convert all of his land to grapes.

New grape tyers and grape pickers are trained to do a quality job by Mr. Q, who spends the first day with them and has one of the experienced workers help them until skill is developed. A quality check is exercised on pickers by having them write their name on the filled crates. The hired man works with new apple pickers. Mr. Q does not believe in "constantly bothering his workers."

FARM OPERATOR CONCERNS. Mr. Q said his biggest problem was to find workers, especially men to harvest apples and to trim grapes. He feels he competes with the steel mills in the large urban center for some of the day-haul help.

Summaries of Interviews with Selected Workers on Vegetable Farms

WORKER CASE 1. Mr. A is one of three Negro sub-foremen on a 1500 acre farm devoted primarily to growing sweet corn. In addition to 120 southern migrants employed seasonally on a piece-work basis and thirty contract Puerto Ricans employed seasonally on an hourly basis, there are eight regular workers. Two are year-round, and one of these serves as overall foreman. Six, including Mr. A and the other two sub-foremen, work on the farm nine months out of the year and return to Florida for the balance of the time.

Mr. A has his family with him, and they are satisfied with farm life. He has never sought a job through the Employment Service and found out about the present job while working on another farm. Although other farm and non-farm employers have tried to hire him away by offering him more money, he likes his present employer and job. He feels that he can do any job on the farm and that his skills have increased on the job. A good machinery and automobile operator, he supervises a crew during the ten-week harvest season, checks the trucks and does a variety of seasonal farm work.

Mr. A makes \$1.50 per hour and usually works a ten- to thirteen-hour day. In addition, he participates in a cash bonus plan based upon the farm production. He receives a house, heat, electricity, water, gas, expenses for garden supplies, health insurance, life insurance, Workmen's Compensation, and use of the equipment as needed. He takes weekends

off if he desires. He has never had sick leave because he has not been sick.

Mr. A receives a general set of directions every morning from his employer. He feels that he can make decisions if the boss is not present and that his advice is sought. Mr. A feels that good employer-employee relationships are all due to the way the employer treats the worker — "They don't abuse you, they don't curse you, and they're a good boss."

WORKER CASE 2. Mr. B is the 27-year-old married foreman on a large vegetable farm which has two other year-round workers and about forty contract Puerto Ricans employed about nine months annually.

Mr. B was farm-raised, had two years of high school, including some vocational agriculture, and has been with his present employer for six years. He likes "the outdoors" part of farm work, the variety of different things which he may do in a day, and the feeling of independence which he has compared with his experience at a non-farm job. His major objection is the need to work as many hours as necessary to get a job done at a particular time. The outside work in the winter also is of some concern. Although he has thought about a job change, primarily to provide more security when he retires, he has no definite plans to change at present. His wife is somewhat dissatisfied with farm life largely because of the long working hours and because she thinks he is capable of doing better than he is now.

Mr. B builds, maintains, and operates equipment. He is in charge of two sub-foremen and, seasonally, he works with one of the Puerto Rican crews. In the summer he receives \$1.80 per hour and works on a rather rigid schedule putting in more than eight hours a day. If he works more than sixty hours a week, he gets overtime at time and a half. During the winter he makes \$100 a week; his time schedule is very flexible; and he has Saturday afternoon and all day Sunday off. In 1965 he had seven days off for holidays plus four days of vacation with pay. Sick days are paid; at one time he was off work six weeks but continued on full pay. He is provided Social Security, Workmen's Compensation, accident insurance, and allowed to have the use of equipment. He estimates his monthly earnings at between \$465 and \$470. A \$50 bond was received as a gift at Christmas. Mr. B would like a profit-sharing or incentive program, or some opportunity for advancement.

Mr. B feels that bad employer-employee relationships result if the employee has to ask for an increase in pay and if the employee is

made to "feel like a machine." To allow the employee to make his own decisions, he felt, was one of the main things making for good relations. He expressed the view that unions would be good for farm employees and that farmers are exempt from too many of the laws which apply to non-farm employers. He thinks probably there should be some type of a written contract for farm employees to facilitate understanding and to clarify "what they will be able to work toward in the future." Also, he feels the trend is to replace white farm workers except for key positions, and that they are even being replaced in some of these.

Summaries of Interviews with Selected Workers on Fruit Farms

WORKER CASE 3. Mr. C is a Negro crew leader working on a fruit farm devoted primarily to apples. He first came to this farm in 1965 and expects to return next year. In 1965 the farm employed thirty-five seasonal interstate workers. This individually-operated farm also has five year-round, full-time workers in farm operations, three in packing operations, a part-time employee, and an office worker.

Mr. C has been leading labor crews for about six years. He completed five years of school. He brings from his home base in the southeastern United States people whom he knows and those whom they, in turn, know. When he arrives in the North, his crews are usually smaller than he anticipated, so he goes into nearby population centers to look for available workers. The major crop picked in 1965 was apples, but on the way North peaches were picked in Virginia. After the New York harvest was completed the crew moved to Ontario for more apple picking. In 1966 cherries were picked in central New York, but before the apple picking started there was a shortage of work for about a month. During this time Mr. C tried to find work for his crew.

On the present job Mr. C receives payment for general supervision. The piece-rate in 1965 was 20¢ per box for picking apples, with a 3¢ bonus if the worker stayed until the end of the season. Also, the employer provided members of the crew with housing, electricity, fuel, Social Security, Workmen's Compensation, and local transportation, which brought the estimated cost per box to the employer to 37¢. In 1966, picking rates were raised 2¢ per box.

Supervision of the seasonal workers is generally done jointly by one of the farm foremen and the crew leader. The crew leader instructs new workers on how to do the tasks.

Mr. C seems to be able to keep his men working on the job in a fashion that satisfies the employer. He feels that the foreman, whom he considers his immediate boss, is a nice man for whom to work. He

finds that this is a good setup; he is treated correctly; and he enjoys working on this farm. Also, Mr. C stated that New York is a good state for jobs and "better than other states."

Commenting on changes, Mr. C feels that five or ten years ago he could get good workers to come north in his crew, but those that come now are "nowheres near as good." He feels that the relationship between crew leaders and farmers is likely to be changing. He has already been approached about organizing workers in the coming year in order to determine wages. Also, the nature of the work in Florida has changed so that a person can work there the year around without having to move north with the migrant stream. "You can find all the work you want in Florida."

WORKER CASE 4. Mr. D is a 28-year-old married foreman on a 500 acre fruit farm on which he has been employed four years. The farm is operated by the owner, his son, five other year-round employees who formerly were migrants from the South, and about thirty Negro interstate seasonal workers who do not have a special crew leader. Mr. D was not farm-raised and has had experience on non-farm jobs. He has completed high school with a year of vocational agriculture. In addition to being foreman, he now owns a small fruit farm. Mr. D and his wife are active in a wide range of formal organizations and some of their activities are with the employer and his wife.

Mr. D started as a farm laborer because he found he was "an outdoor boy." In farm work "There's never a dull moment — especially when you have a little responsibility to keep you on your toes." "Once in a while you go to meetings and meet a lot of different people — kind of makes you feel that it's a little more than just a job." He particularly likes fruit farming "because it's demanding to a point, but yet it lets a guy have a day here and a day there when he doesn't have to worry — like this winter if I'm going to take a vacation, I can go for two or three weeks and nobody's going to miss me... On a dairy farm you're really tied down."

Mr. D estimates his farm earnings at between \$500 and \$600 per month. He receives \$100 per week in cash, gasoline for his automobile, the use of the pickup truck, garden expenses, and a health insurance policy. He also is permitted to use one of the farm employees on his own place. There is no overtime, profit-sharing, or bonus plan.

Mr. D said he had a clear understanding of his responsibilities and privileges when he went to work on this farm. Each year he has been given more responsibility. He would like training which would allow him to do jobs he does not presently perform. A course at Cornell

University for one or two weeks every year to cover thoroughly such topics as soil analysis, fertilization, and herbicides would appeal to him. Looking ahead, his goal is to save money and acquire more land of his own or to become manager of a large fruit operation.

Supplementary Information on Labor Practices on Fruit and Vegetable Farms

In contrast with dairy and poultry farms, fruit and vegetable farms were characterized by, one, the large number of workers required at the seasonal work peak as compared with the low period; two, the large proportion of the required workers who do only manual labor of a type usually considered unskilled; three, the use of non-local "migrant" workers; and, four, the relatively complex labor organization generally found, in part because of the comparatively large scale of operations. Fruit farms tend to have a much shorter peak period of employment than vegetable farms. Nearness to urban centers makes the use of day-haul and commuting local seasonal workers feasible for some employers. The interviews revealed employer differences in worker preferences; for example, some much preferred Puerto Rican contract workers and others rejected Puerto Ricans in favor of Negroes based in Florida or other southeastern states.

In view of such variations, it is impossible for the few cases described to reflect all of the worker-management practices discovered in the interviews on fruit and vegetable farms. Interviews on other farms brought out certain additional characteristics of farms, operations, and practices which contrasted with those previously described, and they are summarized below:

FARMS. The size of the enterprises in the study ranged from 180 to 2000 acres. Capital investment was estimated at from about \$100,000 to in excess of \$1,000,000. Gross farm income in 1965 varied from \$40,000 to about \$1,000,000.

OPERATORS. Although all the farmers either owned all the land operated or rented only a small acreage, the one-person owner-operator is in the minority. Multiple owner-operators, most commonly father-son or brother arrangements, predominated.

LABOR FORCE AND LABOR FORCE ORGANIZATION. In multiple owner-operator situations, specialization of function was characteristic. Wives had a recognized management, supervisory, or work role in a number of cases, especially in the single owner-operator situa-

tions. Daughters as well as sons often performed farm operations during the busiest season.

All farms had one or more full-time, year-round men; these, too, had specialized roles such as foreman, mechanic, equipment operator, or laborer. Some of these were Negroes who had formerly been "migrants."

Most farms hired either Puerto Rican or Negro interstate seasonal workers; some used both. A few depended entirely on local sources of seasonal workers such as day-haul from an urban center, local women, or local high school students.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION. Personal contacts and informal channels were used most frequently by employers for the recruitment of both year-round and seasonal workers. The Employment Service was used more for seasonal, especially interstate, workers than for year-round employees. In one case, an employers' labor cooperative was the intermediary between the Employment Service and the employer. In other cases, after initial use of the Employment Service to get a crew, returning crew leaders or workers did the recruiting. A farmer producing for the fresh market felt he had to be more selective in the workers he employed than he would have been if producing for processing.

Newspaper ads were used by some of these employers to attract regular workers. One employer interviewed about one hundred persons before deciding on the full-time man most recently employed. This employer checks the applicant's recommendations from former employers and his financial responsibility; he carefully studies the personality of the individual to see if he would be compatible and would meet the high requirements of the job.

Employment of sons of local farmers, visits with men known to be considering a job change, and contacts with other farmers at feed stores and similar places are among the other recruiting practices.

WAGES, HOURS, AND PRIVILEGES. Full-time, year-round workers on these farms were paid on either an hourly or a weekly rate; in one case the rate was hourly in the summer and weekly in the winter. Skill, length of service, and privileges such as housing were important factors that accounted for wide variations in the wage rates.

The work day and work week in the growing and harvesting seasons were geared to the requirements of the necessary operations and were longer and more irregular than during the rest of the year. Several employers pay overtime after a specified number of hours per week, sixty hours in one case. Arrangements, often specific, for vacations and days off were common.

Seasonal workers engaged in harvesting were generally reported to be on a piece-rate basis. Those in other operations were generally on an hourly basis. Puerto Ricans under contract had a guaranteed minimum number of hours of work per week at specified rates. A general practice was to offer a bonus to encourage Puerto Rican and Negro interstate workers to stay until the end of the season. Some form of perquisites were generally a part of the arrangement for these workers.

One employer provided a TV room and a baseball field. He had a chuck wagon in the field to provide lunch. The same employer hired a bus and took all of his workers to the World's Fair. He also took them to a supermarket each week so that they could buy the food needed for the next week. In addition, he attempted to set up a library for the workers to use during their leisure.

Poultry Farms

According to Table VII on p. 15 in 1959 there were 1,144 poultry farms in New York State with 2,303 workers on their payrolls. These workers constituted about 5 percent of all regular and seasonal farm employees. Thus, poultry farms involve a relatively small part of the total farm labor market in New York State.

The relative importance of the poultry industry was taken into account in selecting the types of farms to be visited in connection with the 1966 survey of farm labor. Four farms out of a total of twenty-eight visited obtained their principal cash income from the sale of poultry products. Two of these farms were located in the Hudson Valley, one in the central plains, and one in the southern tier area bordering on Pennsylvania. None was very close to a major industrial center.

One of these cases is summarized below to provide an illustration of the kinds of labor-management practices followed, some of the problems that exist from management's point of view, and the poultry farm as a place to work as seen by one employee. Illustrations of labor-management relationships and problems from other farms are also presented to indicate the variety of situations encountered.

Farm No. 16

THE FARM. Farm No. 16 is a poultry farm of 135 acres with 40,000 layers. In 1965 its approximate value was \$250,000 and the gross income was about \$220,000. The property was almost free of debt. Since 1960, major labor-saving devices such as automatic waterers and feeders, egg rails, and bulk feed delivery have been installed. Replacements for the layers are raised on the farm.

THE OPERATOR. The owner-operator is 46 years old, married, and has one daughter. He is a high school graduate and has taken some college courses. In 1965 he had two off-farm jobs (fire insurance agent and law enforcement officer) in addition to management of the poultry business. His wife teaches school. He is active in many organizations.

THE LABOR FORCE. The owner supervises all operations, but there is a division of labor among the employees. He had six full-time employees in 1966 and two or three part-time workers who helped with special jobs as required. One elderly man (on sick leave when the visit was made) has the title of foreman. He also repairs equipment and does all of the plumbing and electrical work. One man is in charge of the egg room, takes charge of candling, grading, and retail sales. Each of the other four regular men is responsible for taking care of 10,000 layers (two were high school boys who were going back to school in September).

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION. New workers are recruited through the local school and present employees. Dropouts from the local high school have been used. The operator said he always had a waiting list of these boys but some of them are "fellows of the type you just wouldn't want." The fact that farm workers are eligible for deferment from military service could have something to do with the availability of some of these boys.

The operator said it is getting more difficult to get the type of person he wants, and that skilled help is in short supply, although turnover is not a problem. Most of this problem, he said, had arisen from the expansion of nearby industrial employment which offered better paying jobs. There is also competition from other farmers for good workers. He pointed out that "most of the poultry farmers in our area are dealing with a low calibre individual like we have." He has never used the Employment Service.

WAGES, HOURS, AND PRIVILEGES. Three men live on the farm. One is paid \$60 per week and is furnished a trailer and all utilities, which amounts to a total of about \$340 per month. Two young men draw \$57 per week each and provide their own trailer. The owner pays for the "hook up" to utilities and other site costs for this trailer, but the employees furnish heat. The other workers also live in trailers with most of the utilities furnished by the owner. Eggs are sold to employees at a price below the market. A few years ago eggs were supplied without charge, but it was found that employees were

taking more than they could use and supplying them free to relatives.

Employees are covered by Social Security and Workmen's Compensation. They have three paid holidays, and those who have the longest service are given a week of vacation with pay which they are allowed to take when the work is relatively slack. Six days of eight hours each from 7:30 A.M. to 4:30 P.M. with an hour off for lunch is the work week. Very little overtime is worked, but when there is need for it, employees are paid at regular rates. One man works every Sunday and gets \$3 per week more than the others. A turkey is furnished each worker at Thanksgiving and a cash bonus is paid at Christmas.

TRAINING, SUPERVISION, AND MANAGEMENT. There is no great problem, according to the operator, in training high school youths to do the routine work assignments, but he admitted that he could not expect them to take on very difficult jobs. He never hires anybody who has worked on another farm because generally such boys are too set in their ways. The operator depends on one of the older men to supervise when he is away, but he checks on what is being done several times a day. He spends about half of his time each day inspecting, supervising, and training as required.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION. The owner may need to replace the foreman, who is 73 and has been ill. Other industries in the area are paying more for skilled workers than he says he can afford to pay. In fact, it will be harder to recruit even unskilled men in the future for the same reason. Competition from non-farm employers is strictly on a wage basis according to this owner.

In addition, there is competition from other farmers in the area who are bidding more actively for unskilled workers than they used to. He says other poultry farmers in the area also hire "low calibre individuals like we have. They're dealing with a type of individual that they're bringing up through a New York employment office where they're paying \$100 a month and they furnish the food and a trailer. These boys are coming and going all the time.... I have applications from parolees, but I can't see myself hiring these boys. Maybe I'm unfair, but this is my personal feeling."

This owner summed up his feelings about his employees in these words: "Well, we're satisfied with them. The only thing is that I'd prefer if we could get at least some of the boys of a higher calibre that would be able to read and write."

OWNER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONSHIPS. The owner expressed himself in general as follows: "What workers do away from this place

is their business except that they must not moonlight on another poultry farm. I have loaned employees money when requested. They get time off on special occasions without being docked. We hunt and fish together and I have taken them to dinners at the sportsmen's club. They also have the use of the truck on occasion. In the case of the egg room man, we share family interests and activities. We have gone out of our way to keep good workers who said they could not afford to pay rents in town and have furnished them with trailers."

Practices the owner feels should be avoided: "Well, I think today you can't be very strict with the employees. . . . I'm pretty positive that a farmer can't operate today just walking around the farm with a white shirt on. People resent undue influences or bossism."

This farmer would like to increase his operation to 100,000 layers. He has not been able to do so, mainly, he says, because he cannot obtain the necessary type of person who could help him supervise.

So far as hiring workers is concerned, he seems to think he can continue to depend on recruiting high school dropouts, although it may be more difficult to hire even these in the future at his wage level. To compensate he is planning on more investment in equipment: "This is why we're having a great change-over from floor operations to cage operations."

EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES AND ASPIRATIONS. The worker interviewed in this case, Mr. A, was a young man of twenty years who was raised on a farm and had nearly completed the work for a high school diploma. His experience included one factory production job that he found boring and left four years ago for his current employer. His present job is to candle, grade, and sell eggs at retail.

Mr. A's current wage is \$63 per week. He has one day a week off from work and gets paid overtime for work over eight hours per day. He lives at home with his parents.

Mr. A. is interested in his job and is especially concerned about health problems of chickens. He told about watching with intense interest a whole flock of chickens recover from an illness and the consequent improvement in their egg production.

This employee feels his lack of formal education to be a drawback which he believes would make it difficult for him to find another job. He considered changing jobs in 1965 but did not find another opening that he liked better than his present work.

Mr. A. is quite happy with his relationship to his present employer and mentioned specifically the raises obtained without asking for them, loans, and help with personal problems. He feels his employer gives

him a good deal of responsibility with only general instructions and relies on him to protect his interests. He feels motivated, therefore, to do everything to the best of his ability.

Supplementary Information on Labor Practices on Other Poultry Farms

LABOR FORCE. Year-round hired help is used on all farms, but one farm uses only part-time workers, mostly youths in school, to supplement unpaid family workers.

RATES OF PAY. The starting hourly rate for inexperienced workers is \$1.00. Raises are given as people are trained and become more productive. Wages seem to be competitive with dairy farms in the same region. All farmers reported paying Christmas bonuses. One operator provides a one-week vacation with pay to experienced year-round workers, sick leave, and time off on special occasions; another farmer pays overtime rates for extra hours and grants three paid holidays per year. Social Security coverage is provided and one farmer provides Workmen's Compensation. None of the four farms covered provides other insurance coverage such as life, health, or major medical.

HOURS. Full-time employees work eight to nine hours per day six days a week. Number of hours worked on Sunday ranges from two to six.

RECRUITMENT. Various sources for recruitment of labor are used, such as schools, present employees, and advertising. There is little use made of the Employment Service or other agencies. Two farmers expressed dissatisfaction with people referred by this Service: "They don't want to work." Some employers try to find retired farmers to hire.

TURNOVER AND REPLACEMENTS. Most farmers interviewed had not experienced high turnover and several stressed that their employees had been with them for many years. Those who have had to hire recently feel that the labor supply has dwindled because fewer young people are coming off farms and more are taking jobs in cities and urban areas.

TRAINING. On-the-job training is provided for new employees. A few employees expressed interest in taking formal training if it were available.

GENERAL LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS. There were a variety of practices and attitudes demonstrated in the field of labor-management relations. One farmer expressed the opinion that shortage

of manpower in the future would handicap poultry farm expansion more than egg prices or feed costs. He maintains that the poverty program, for which he saw no need locally, was providing a disincentive for people to take jobs. But the kinds of people he has hired, i.e., school dropouts, cannot get factory jobs because they are unable "to fill out the application forms." The Viet Nam War has increased hiring at plants in the region, and this has absorbed much of the labor supply. He feels that maintaining close personal relationships with the boys he hires has a good deal to do with keeping them on his farm. "I've always said that if they had any problems, they could always discuss them with me. A problem on the farm, at home, or wherever. If an employee wants to buy a car, I've always lent him the money. We've always tried to be very fair with them because we realize that if we don't have the employees we just won't have the farm."

Another farmer responded to the question about what makes for successful labor-management relations in this way: "I think treating them as equals, more or less.... Pay them the same as other places. When they are doing a good job we try to praise them and let them know that we appreciate it." This employer feels that the one key thing missing in his relationship with employees is a pension plan. He would like to establish one for them (presumably in addition to Social Security) and would like coverage for himself.

An employee on a highly mechanized farm expressed the opinion that mechanization requires a higher calibre of help and reliable attendance, and therefore wages will have to go up in order to attract and hold the desired type of worker. Another worker on this farm, a young woman who washes eggs, expressed satisfaction with her job and the pay (\$1.35 per hour), but wished she could be provided with hospitalization insurance.

In general the interviews with employees did not locate anyone who was very dissatisfied. Presumably those who were very unhappy with their jobs had already quit, but the responses from employers and employees indicated that their relationships were, on the whole, mutually satisfactory. Many employees had been on the job for several years. In other situations farmers were hiring young men and women with relatively little education whom they felt could be replaced as necessary. The main concern of those who were disturbed about the manpower situation was the growing shortage of experienced workers and of workers who could take supervisory responsibilities.

IV

Some General Observations

THE LIMITED AMOUNT OF INFORMATION about "successful" worker-management relations on New York State farms collected and presented in this study does not support very many broad generalizations. For one thing, as the preceding pages have shown, there are a number of different labor-management situations and agreements. They differ according to the duration of employment (year-round vs. seasonal or part-time); the kinds and sources of the people employed (northern farm-raised men, migrants, Puerto Ricans, or city day-haul workers); the size, location, and economic status of the farms; and other factors affecting farmer-worker relationships. All of these variables, however, were more or less known before the study was undertaken, and the interviews were structured to bring out the differences.

At the same time, one of the principal objectives was to see if certain common features of commonly accepted "successful" relationships could be identified and if something could be learned about what, in the opinions of farmers and workers, makes for "success" as well as what policies and practices should be avoided. Another question which the study sought to answer by interviews with employers and workers was: "What is meant by 'success' in this context and how can degrees of success be measured?" A few observations on these two points are in order before going into some of the more limited findings.

In compiling a list of farms to be visited, suggestions were solicited from a variety of sources including county extension agents, specialists at Cornell, and farm employment specialists in the Division of Employment, New York State Department of Labor. No attempt was made to

spell out precisely what was meant by success, except to indicate in a general way that a search was being made for situations in which farmers were able to get and keep the workers needed to do their work and in which workers were reasonably content with their jobs and with their employers. Indications of lack of "success" that entered into the selection were such things as high rates of turnover in personnel, necessitating a good deal of recruiting for replacements; an inability to get good quality of work done; crop losses due to lack of labor in the case of fruits and vegetables; and the general reputation of the farm as a relatively poor place to work. By implicit definition, therefore, farms which had the reputation of being poor places to work because of labor problems were excluded from the survey.

In the interviews that were conducted with those farmers and workers selected to be the "in" group, the opinions of the former were obtained in all cases, but limitations of time prevented complete coverage of worker opinion. For the most part, the employees interviewed were year-round, rather than part-time or seasonal, workers. On the basis of the information collected, however, some tentative generalizations can be made about the positive factors making for successful relationships and some general practices to be avoided can be suggested.

Positive Policies and Practices Making for Good Relationships

1. The achievement of good labor-management relations on the farms visited was not a matter of chance on the part of farmers but rather the result of conscious efforts to produce mutually satisfactory relationships. The farmers visited had given considerable thought to manpower management problems and, in a number of cases, had developed ingenious techniques for bringing about mutually satisfactory relationships.

2. The development of satisfactory relationships could not be attributed to any one practice or policy such as, for example, payment of relatively high wages or bonuses. Such relationships seem to be the end result of a combination of policies and practices on the part of farmers and of a genuine liking for farm work and their employers on the part of employees.

3. Economic incentives (wages, bonuses, fringe benefits, etc.) play an important part in making for good relationships, but both employers and workers stressed the importance of "fair" treatment—of consideration for workers as human beings rather than as hired hands,

of taking into account the personal problems of workers and helping to find solutions when necessary, and of getting the right fit of man and job. The relationships covered in this study were not "bought" with money nor were they the result exclusively of human relations techniques. Wages paid tended to be at the going local rate but with adjustments for differences in the productivity of individuals, experience, and length of time on the job.

4. Farmers with successful relationships with employees also exhibit flexibility in meeting their labor needs. As the supply of labor has dwindled during the past few years, alert farmers on fruit, vegetable, and poultry farms especially have made greater use of youths, women, part-time men, men from nearby centers who are available for seasonal day-haul jobs, and Puerto Ricans. Greater use of such workers has increased the need for more attention to training and for having flexible work schedules.

5. On the eleven fruit and vegetable farms where the question was discussed, in nearly all cases supervision of seasonal labor was being performed directly by the owner-operators or by one or more regular employees rather than by the crew leaders who recruited and transported the workers. Such direct supervision gave the owners direct information about the individuals who were working for them, their personal qualifications and problems, their productivity on different jobs, and their potential usefulness as recruiters of desirable replacements. In some cases, former southern migrant workers have become regular employees and are used as supervisors. In other cases, Puerto Ricans have been selected by owners for training as equipment operators. Direct contact between owners and seasonal workers has been an important factor in a number of cases in building up and retaining seasonal work forces that return to the same farms each year and in the weeding out of the less desirable workers.

6. Several operators who hire large numbers of migrants and Puerto Ricans stressed the problem of getting good quality workers and persuading them to return year after year. Some of the inducements used to keep the best workers coming back were reported to be the providing of steady work between crops so that there are no idle days with no work and no wages, the training of qualified workers as equipment operators with appropriate wage increases, the paying of transportation costs for Puerto Ricans who have proven their abilities and have returned for two or more years to the same farm, and the upgrading of experienced seasonal workers to year-round jobs with some supervisory responsibilities. A number of farmers interviewed are providing fringe

benefits not required by law in order to retain good workers and increase productivity. These benefits consist of bonuses for staying on the job or increasing output, and for regular workers paid vacations, paid sick leave, regularized hours, and the free use of equipment, in addition to the more usual items such as "free" housing and food items. There are indications that farmers and their employees are thinking about the desirability of adding other fringe benefits, especially medical care insurance.

In addition to these general positive features that characterized the relationships observed, there are a number of specific policies and practices which were noted. Some of these, which have general applicability, are listed in the checklist of "do's and don'ts" in Appendix A. Other positive policies and means of dealing with labor-management problems associated with different types of farm work are best discussed in connection with the major types of farm enterprises covered in the survey.

Practices to be Avoided

Both farmers and workers interviewed had something to say about general practices to be avoided. Some of these seem so obvious that it is hard to believe that any employer in this day and age needs to be warned against their use. Yet the frequency with which workers mentioned that "bad" employers shout and curse at them is more than suggestive. Difficulties also arise when workers are hired and not given a sufficiently explicit set of instructions about what they are expected to do. This apparently happens when a worker has had some experience and the farmer assumes his new employee will know intuitively how things should be done. Other sources of friction and poor relationships, such as the long hours of work expected of year-round workers, the lack of formal training and education for workers who want to learn more about technical aspects of their jobs, and the differences in cultural and language backgrounds of seasonal workers, are much more difficult to remedy. Yet some farmers have made progress in dealing with these problems, as the following summaries of practices by industry show.

Problems on Dairy Farms

On these farms the long hours of work each day and the need to care for dairy cows seven days a week constitute important handicaps in recruiting and retaining good quality workers. Some of the inter-

views suggest ways by which these problems can be partially overcome, assuming that the workers basically like to work on a dairy farm. The hours per day have been fixed on some farms by a specific schedule, e.g., 6 A.M. to 6 P.M. with time off for breakfast and the noon meal and the agreement that overtime at time and a half would be paid for hours beyond 6 P.M. When there are two or more men capable of doing the milking, it is possible to give the employee and his employer some Sundays free of all work. Some farmers also recognize that workers may need time off during the week to shop or do chores around their homes. The problems of providing workers with time away from work become more manageable as the size of the operation and the number of employees increase. Since year-round employees are frequently men with families, it is important for farmers to recognize that a common cause of dissatisfaction on the part of wives and children is the amount of time the husband and father must spend away from them.

A few of the interviews bring out the point that the close working relationship between the farmer and his employee(s) on a dairy farm can be a mixed blessing. It can lead to effective communications and the development of very satisfactory relationships both on the job and off it. There is also the chance that, if personalities are not compatible, or if there is not sufficient attention to spelling out responsibilities, poor relationships will develop.

On some farms the farmer seems to have a very low opinion of his employee's ability, motivation, and prospects. The relationship may continue because neither employer nor worker wants to make a change for the present. It seems unlikely that such situations will persist indefinitely in a period of growing employment opportunities. Such a condition can hardly be considered satisfactory or successful, because the farmer's attitudes are bound to be communicated to, and affect, employee performance. Constructive and mutually beneficial relationships on other farms are based on mutual feelings that the work is important, is worth doing well, and that both worker and employer are important and deserve respect.

Some of the more progressive farmers interviewed said they had no problems in recruiting workers because of their general reputations, attractive wages, and generally good conditions. These farmers are concerned about how to improve the quality, not the quantity, of the labor they can attract. They stressed the importance of being able to compete with factories and other industries for skilled workers. These farmers, however, are exceptions already in that they are among the largest operators, pay better than average wages, and are considering further expansion to derive benefits from a larger scale of operations.

Problems on Fruit and Vegetable Farms

Interviews with farmers on fruit and vegetable farms indicate that, for the most part, their chief concern about labor has to do with the quality and quantity of help for seasonal work, and not so much with year-round workers. Many of the latter have worked for the same employer for long periods, and turnover is low.

There is general agreement among farmers that the supply of southern migrant workers is drying up and that the quality of those coming north under the supervision of crew leaders is deteriorating. Crews arrive with only part of the group that was formed in the South and crew leaders seek replacements in nearby metropolitan centers. The causes of the shrinking supply were not explored fully in this study but are said by the farmers and workers interviewed to be related to growing opportunities for steady jobs in the southern states; the increasing irregularity of seasonal harvesting work, partly because machines have taken over some tasks; and the unattractive features of seasonal farm work and farm labor camps.

Farmers have met, in a number of ways, the problems caused by a declining supply of migrant workers and the cutting off of easy access to foreign sources of supply by the enforcement of government regulations. Some have found that dealing directly with Negroes from the South and building up good working relations has assured a satisfactory labor supply. Several vegetable growers have developed satisfactory seasonal crews of Puerto Ricans whom they hire directly or under approved contracts. These farmers pay special attention to ways and means of pleasing their Puerto Rican workers in order to keep them coming back year after year. They also use the people who return regularly to recruit replacements as required. Other farmers have made greater use of day-haul and part-time workers from nearby industrial centers. Some have employed women and school-age youths. In short, a number of the farmers interviewed showed that they had made use of a number of different sources of labor supply and a variety of methods of recruitment. In most cases the farmers who seemed to have developed mutually satisfactory relationships dealt directly with workers themselves rather than through an intermediary such as a crew leader.

In nearly all situations where seasonal workers are involved, there are special labor-management problems that required the farmer's attention. For example, Puerto Ricans are said to be temperamental and therefore cannot be shouted at or pressed too hard. They often know little English, and therefore communications are sometimes difficult. Some fruit growers say Puerto Ricans cannot handle ladders and there-

fore are not satisfactory apple pickers. Yet for other jobs they have proved to be very good workers. A serious problem which no one seems to have solved concerns the provision of adequate housing for Puerto Ricans who would like to bring their families with them, especially when they are expected to stay for eight to ten months of the year. In some instances it is clear that community acceptance of such workers and their families would be a serious problem even if housing were available.

On some fruit farms, e.g., grape farms, there is a shortage of skilled workers for some operations. This situation has been met by using those who have such skills on a part-time basis and to some extent by training women on the job. There is little indication in the interviews that farmers have as yet thought very much about the possibilities of solving skilled labor shortages by means of group training programs with or without the help of formal local vocational educational programs.

Problems on Poultry Farms

Poultry farmers, like those in other industries, have encountered labor shortages at wages they feel they can afford to pay. Their solutions to the problems have varied considerably, but a number of those interviewed have made greater use than formerly of women, youths, and people who wished to work only part-time. Another development has been greater mechanization of the feeding, watering, and egg collection processes. As in the case of other farms, the operator who has built up mutually satisfactory relationships with a variety of types of workers has had to give considerable attention to manpower management. So far the supply of people willing to take low-wage jobs and stay with them seems to have been adequate to get the work done.

The principal labor problem confronting poultry farmers seems to be a shortage of experienced, skilled workers who can take responsibility for supervision and management. Training on the job may not be adequate to develop such skills, and the employment of high school dropouts, women, and older workers may not supply the types of people who have the necessary aptitudes.

Some Observations from the Employee's Point of View

It is obvious from the reactions of many workers interviewed that one of the chief reasons why they were working on farms rather than in other jobs is that they have a genuine liking for farm work. The dairy

workers liked animals and the poultry workers liked chickens. The year-round workers on vegetable and fruit farms liked to see things grow. This liking for the nature of the work itself undoubtedly has a good deal to do with the development of satisfactory worker-employer relationships. Some farmers, however, seem to be unaware of this source of worker satisfaction and therefore do not take full advantage of the potential for growth in ability, knowledge, and productivity latent in their present employees. In addition, this enjoyment of the work does not seem to have been fully recognized in the recruitment and selection of new employees.

From the year-round worker's point of view one of the important drawbacks to farm work is the lack of opportunity for him to develop as much on the job as he may be able to. On-the-job training has its limitations; there is little or no provision at present for additional formal technical education or training. The limitations on the development of skill and knowledge have been recognized in some cases but nothing has been done about them.

In spite of these drawbacks to farm work, most of the year-round workers interviewed seemed to like their jobs and not to be very much concerned about the gap between earnings on the farm and those in factories. One must conclude that these people find in the opportunities to be outdoors, to be free from close supervision, and to raise their families on farms genuine sources of satisfaction that more money *per se* cannot buy.

Appendix:

A Check List on Worker-Employer Relations for Consideration by Farm Operators or Managers

Discussions with farmers and their employees brought out a number of points that contribute to satisfactory or unsatisfactory relationships. Sometimes these practices, most of which consist of details, are overlooked by the employer, but, although they may seem "small potatoes" to him, they may seem much more important to his employees. A list of practices that make for mutually satisfactory relationships has been compiled from the records of interviews and is presented below for the information and guidance of farmers.

1. Do you discuss with a new employee the specifications of the job he is expected to do and tell him how you want it done? Some employers evidently expect a new employee to know these things without being told. This practice often later results in misunderstandings.
2. Do you establish a mutually satisfactory trial period when a new employee is hired? Such a period gives both parties a chance to find out if they can work together satisfactorily and may be helpful to both parties.
3. Do you hand, or send, employees their pay when it is due? Some employers have made their workers ask for their wages or salary which has been resented.
4. If you feel that a worker is worth a raise and are ready to grant one, do you give it without being asked? Employees much prefer to have the raise without having to ask for it.
5. Do you tell an employee in some way when you think he has done a good job? Some employers are free with criticism but never think to give employees a word of praise.

6. Do you give employees as much responsibility as possible? Some employers hold back on delegation of responsibility without realizing that, as a result, employees may feel that they are not fully trusted and that their abilities are not appreciated.
7. Do you establish a regular schedule of work for employees which takes into account their need for regular hours on and off the job? Regular employees usually need some time to shop when stores are open.
8. If you provide for a paid vacation, do you arrange the time well in advance so as to permit the employee to make plans for trips, etc.?
9. Do you follow the established management rule of one man, one boss? Workers usually like to get their orders from one source.
10. Do you try to schedule work so as to use employee time most efficiently and thus cut down on long days? The long hours of work on farms are often cited as one of the serious drawbacks to this kind of work, and some workers think the hours are unnecessarily long.
11. Do you try to adjust the work assignments to the interests, personalities, and abilities of individual employees? For example, if a worker likes to milk and is good at it, do you give him this opportunity or do you have him spend his time on other jobs that he does not like so well?
12. Do you show favoritism to employees and to relatives? In cases in which this has happened, it usually creates resentment.
13. Do you take the trouble to find out what additional knowledge or training employees would like to have in order to improve their performance? Some employees are anxious to improve their performance and would welcome opportunities to have some training.
14. If you furnish housing for regular workers, do you take the initiative to see that it is maintained in good order? Keeping wives of employees satisfied with their housing helps to keep their husbands on the job.

